DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 230	EC 090 498

AUTHOR	Stephens, Preston C.
TITLE	Developing a Model Appraisal and Record System for Special Education Services in Local School Districts. Maxi II Practicum Report.
INSTITUTION	Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE	Apr 76
NOTE	217p.; Maxi II Practicum Report, Nova University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Policy; *Demonstration Projects; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotionally Disturbed; Exceptional Child Education; *Learning Disabilities; *Mentally Handicapped; School Districts; Special Education; Student Evaluation; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS	*CASE; *Council for Administrators of Special Education; Texas (San Antonio)

ABSTRACT

The appraisal awareness committee of Region XX (made up of 51 school districts in the San Antonio, Texas area) CASE (Council for Administrators of Special Education) studied issues connected with the student appraisal process particularly in the categories of language/learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, and mentally handicapped. The committee was subdivided into five groups to provide solutions to a need for legal protection, a need for uniform eligibility standards, a need for a standard set of forms, a need for a model appraisal flow chart, and a need to standardize the roles of supportive personnel. Solutions to all of the needs but the last (dealing with role standardization) were proposed. The majority of the items were accepted by Region XX CASE, and an Appraisal Awareness Seminar was held to explain the recommendations. The project was evaluated along three areas: process (described in terms of staff, clerical assistance, facility utilization, and monetary support); products resulting from the project (including reports of the various committees, a set of forms for implementing a common appraisal system, and a manual explaining the model appraisal process); and effects of the project (including a drop in the number of students found eligible for the educable mentally handicapped program due to the requirement of more exact criteria for placement). (Appendixes, which make up the bulk of the document, include information on the organizational meeting and plan, committee reports, the project's manual for understanding the special education appraisal process, a copy of state board policy, and examples of individually administered intelligence tests.) (Author/SB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED125230

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEVELOPING A MODEL APPRAISAL AND RECORD SYSTEM FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES IN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

by Preston C. Stephens

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University

Austin Cluster
Dr. M. G. Bowden, Coordinator

Maxi II Practicum Report
April, 1976

EC090498

Table of Contents

Page

INTRODUCTION . . . . (i)

ABSTRACT . . . . (ii)

CHAPTER ONE 1
    Statement of the Problem

CHAPTER TWO 4
    Background Information

CHAPTER THREE 9
    Presenting a Solution

CHAPTER FOUR 12
    The Practicum Design

CHAPTER FIVE 14
    The Completion

CHAPTER SIX 19
    Evaluation of Practicum

CHAPTER SEVEN 42
    Summary of Evaluation

CHAPTER EIGHT 43
    Importance of the Practicum (further application)

APPENDIX OVERVIEW 45

APPENDIX I
    Organizational Meeting and Plan

APPENDIX II
    Second Organizational Meeting

APPENDIX III
    Example of Year's Continuing Meetings

APPENDIX IV
    Appraisal Awareness Seminars

APPENDIX V
    Example of Early Sub-Committee Report

APPENDIX VI
    Committee Reports

APPENDIX VII
    Committee Survey With No Final Report

APPENDIX VIII
    Region XX, Educational Service Center Follow-up

APPENDIX IX
    Appraisal Awreness Seminars

APPENDIX X
    Pupil Transfer Between Districts

APPENDIX XI
    Rough Draft of Manual - Plus Rating Received on Field Testing

APPENDIX XII
    New Revised Manual

APPENDIX XIII
    State Board Policy

APPENDIX XIV
    Examples of Individually Administered Test of Intelligence

INTRODUCTION

A need was expressed by the special education leadership of the area in, around, and south of San Antonio, Texas, to study and make improvements in the appraisal process. This became years project of the membership of the Region XX Council for Administrators of Special Education headed by the writer of this practicum report. It was agreed by the special education leadership, representing fifty-one school districts, that a committee would be established of appraisal and special education administrative personnel. They were to reach an agreement on eligibility standards for students where differences existed, to develop a model record transfer system between districts, to develop a model appraisal system, and to conduct a series of seminars to present these findings.

This practicum report gives the details of those effects and shows the results experienced. In addition to the stated objectives, the effects achieved as an end product of this project are detailed.

Abstract

A need was translated into action as Region XX CASE organized an appraisal awareness committee to study a variety of issues connected with the appraisal process. This committee was sub-divided into five groups to provide solutions to a need for legal protection, a need for uniform eligibility standards, a need for a standard set of forms, a need for a model appraisal flow chart, and a need to standardize the roles of supportive personnel. Solutions to all of the needs perceived were proposed except for the last one which proved to be impossible. The majority of the items were accepted by Region XX CASE and an Appraisal Awareness Seminar was held to explain these recommendations. A large part of the solutions were implemented over the broad target area of Region XX. In addition to those activities which affected the entire fifty-one school districts of the area, some improvements to the appraisal process were made in the writer's home district. The practicum effort is reported as it was conducted in three sections labeled for easier reading as process, product, and effect.

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER I

Statement of the Problem

In 1969 the Legislature of Texas passed and the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 230. This bill authorized that several new categories of handicapped sutdents be eligible to receive service, plus it gave the districts funds and personnel allocations to perform the appraisals necessary to identify and treat these new categories.

The Texas Education Agency (T.E.A.) was given the job to develop appraisal standards as well as to implement the broad provisions of the total special education effort authorized under Senate Bill 230. A bulletin (T.E.A. 711) was published reviewed, revised, and republished to meet this need.

Even with this detailed guidance in written form from T.E.A., the special education administrators in this area have repeatedly expressed concerns over many aspects of the appraisal process. It was found that it was possible for a student to be eligible for special education services in one district and not in another. Despite some T.E.A. regulations there was no agreement on eligibility standards for several categories of handicapped students.

There existed no organized way to transfer records on special education students between the sending district (where the student was) and the receiving district (where the student is going). This resulted in days, perhaps weeks, of uncertainty or improper placement of students transferred.

The total appraisal process was found to be slow and somewhat disorganized no matter which district was being discussed. The time lags between original referral and beginning of service (placement in special education), were too long to be acceptable by regular educators and often times by parents.

The single largest complaint of regular staff personnel was the volume of "red tape" necessary to place students into special education. This was compounded by the fact that the various forms to implement the appraisal process ranged from a high of 31 separate forms in one district, to a low of 22 in another. The average number of forms required to be completed before a student could be placed for the first time in special education (original entry) was 20 separate forms per student. Additional forms were also used in most districts for follow-up and review of placement.

There existed a real lack of understanding of the appraisal process by regular education personnel. Not only did many regular educators resent the process of original entry, they apparently were not in agreement with the need for most, if not all, of the requirements.

Special education personnel throughout the nation and in this area have become more and more concerned with the legal implications of placing in, or denying placement of special education services. In other states lawsuits have been filed against school districts for failure to place students into special education (i.e. John Doe - California). In the Region XX area several districts have had lawsuits for mislabeling students. In addition, the Civil Rights Commission of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission have conducted investigations into charges of misplacement of minority students.

A real need for protection of the students, as well as the educators, was expressed. This concern for legal protection applied to both the majority and the minority student alike.

There was agreement that more uniformity was needed in the appraisal process among all the districts. Since each district felt a need to maintain local autonomy, the decision reached was to study the problem and suggest changes but not to force prior committment to implementation of the findings.

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER II

Backgound Information

Before proceeding, it may prove helpful to provide information to the reader on several items which should enhance the reading of this report. This section is historic, demographic, and administrative in nature and should prove interesting, if not essential, to understanding this report.

All of Texas was divided into geographic catchment areas for the purpose of providing educational supportive services to the local districts. It was determined that 20 Regional Education Service Centers (ESC's) would be created to serve the entire State. After much study, and undoubtedly several compromises, the lines were set. The boundaries of each service center were defined by the counties contained in them, with school districts cutting across county lines being assigned to the county where the central office of the district was located. The number of counties (254), the number of school districts (1125), or even the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of the State, could not be evenly divided by 20 without splitting districts or counties. Thus, some arbitrary lines were drawn.

The writer's district is located in Educational Service Center, Region XX. Region XX covers a 14 county area slightly northwest of San Antonio, all of Bexar County where San Antonio is located, and south by southwest for nearly two-hundred miles to the United States-Mexico border. Altogether there is over 16,000 square miles in the region or for illustration, a land mass the size of Massachusetts and New Hampshire combined. This is approximately six percent of the land mass of the State and ten percent of the population of

Texas. Fifty-one school districts serve the 300,000-plus students residing in this region.

Special education funding is based on a unique formula called Plan A. The formula requires that a population base of 3000 students in ADA be available before the staffing and funding pattern of Plan A can be applied. This forces smaller districts into cooperative arrangements with several other small or with one large district to qualify for Plan A. Failure to form such cooperatives results in districts under 3000 ADA receiving the less generous and more restrictive Plan B special education staff and funds.

The 61st session of the Legislature in 1969 authorized appraisal personnel and required the Texas Education Agency to implement this new State funded service. This was part of Senate Bill 230. Prior to this time appraisal personnel did not exist in most districts even though appraisal requirements did exist.

To implement the appraisal concept the State Board of Education, through the Texas Education Agency, established procedures whereby a local district could do its own appraisals or contract them out through the service centers. This is done by forwarding State funds received by local districts for appraisal purposes on to the service centers.

Nearly all of the centers, except Region XX, set up itinerant appraisal services to serve the districts. This writer headed a committee which advised against such a plan for this region and instead suggested that districts cluster together much in the same manner that cooperatives would later be formed when Plan A was implemented statewide. Thus, the cluster concept was born; combining many districts for the purpose of appraisal services only. Originally there were ten such clusters serving the fifty-one districts.

Plan A implementation was phased in gradually over the next several years. (There are still 250 smaller districts in Texas operating no special education program or operating under Plan B) The cluster concept remained in Region XX during the phase-in stage of Plan A, both in organization and in name. Even today (1975-76 school year) there is only one cooperative which does not officially use the cluster name.

Larger school districts are generally considered single-member clusters now, but with the exception of San Antonio Independent School District and Alamo Heights Independent School District all clusters originally contained two or more districts. Today there are fifteen clusters which are referred to in this practicum report as "district" if only one district is involved, or "cluster" if more than one district is included.

The Region XX area was the first service center area to have all of its districts included in Plan A. This was due in part to the already established concept of clusters for appraisal which forced school superintendents to plan cooperatively and to the strong leadership of regular education personnel such as Dr. Dwaine Estes, Executive Director of Education Service Center, Region XX, Dr. Ivan W. Fitzwater, Superintendent of North East Independent School District, and Vice-Chairman of the National Academy of School Executives, Mr. Callie Smith, then Superintendent of Harlandale Independent School District and now Executive Director of the Texas State Teachers Association, and others too numerous to mention.

While the majority of cooperatives in the remainder of the State are organized primarily to reach the 3000 ADA levels, the clusters in Region XX have such unusual arrangements as one with twelve districts and a total ADA of 37,000 (Cluster IV). Another cluster (Cluster V) of twelve districts, has an ADA over 20,000 and a land area the size of the state of New Jersey.

The directors of special education from each district or cluster have banded together to form an organization known as Region XX Council of Administrators of Special Education (Region XX CASE). It is this writer's privilege to serve as the current chairman of this group and to have done so since its founding several years back. The membership of Region XX CASE is the special education director of each district or cluster, plus any person that the administrator wishes to include as a member. There are fifteen clusters and thus at least fifteen members present when the group meets. All issues are resolved by consensus or by chair's perogative if there is mixed opinion.

Even though there have been many full scale battles over issues which have arisen during the years - there exists no greater mutual admiration society in education today than Region XX CASE members. A good example of this is that the two districts in opposition to one another in the nationally famous Rodriquez Case (Edgewood and Alamo Heights) are both represented at these meetings.

The major weakness of Region XX CASE is that special education administrators do not have authority to speak for their districts. This authority is limited to the superintendent and in some cases to the school board itself. In all cases the special education director of a cluster reports to a board composed of superintendents of each district in the cluster. Special education administrators in single district clusters are generally two steps away on the organizational chart from the district's superintendent. Thus, any sweeping change agreed to by the Region XX CASE membership does not automatically mean its implementation.

Finally, it may prove helpful to the reader to have a list of the clusters and the member districts represented by Region XX CASE. They are as follows:

Cluster I - North East ISD

Cluster II - Northside ISD

Cluster III - San Antonio ISD

Cluster IV - Harlandale ISD
Charlotte ISD
Floresville ISD
Jourdanton ISD
La Vernia ISD
Natalia ISD
Pleasanton ISD
Poteet ISD
Poth ISD
Somerset ISD
Southside ISD
Stockdale ISD

Cluster V - Uvalde ISD
Asherton ISD
Brackett ISD
Carrizo Springs ISD
Crystal City ISD
D'Hanis ISD
Eagle Pass ISD
Knippa ISD
La Pryor ISD
Leakey ISD
Sabinal ISD
Utopia ISD

Cluster VI - Judson ISD

Cluster VII - Kerrville ISD
Bandera ISD
Center Point ISD
Divide ISD
Hunt ISD
Ingram ISD
Medina ISD

Cluster VIII - Edgewood ISD

Cluster IX - Alamo Heights ISD

Cluster X - So. San Antonio ISD

Cluster XI - Hondo ISD
Lytle ISD
Medina Valley ISD

Cluster XII - Pearsall ISD
Cotulla ISD
Devine ISD
Dilley ISD
Encinal ISD

Cluster XIII - Southwest ISD

Cluster XIV - East Central ISD

Cluster XV - Ft. Sam Houston ISD
Lackland ISD
Randolph Field ISD

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER III

Presenting a Solution

With a clear understanding that the problem was "bigger than all of us" the membership of Region XX CASE agreed at its annual summer meeting held in June 1975 at Eagle Pass, Texas to spend the entire next year trying to solve the problems associated with the appraisal process. At the second Fall meeting of Region XX CASE (September, 1975), a plan of action was decided. Especially, it was agreed that the following would be done:

1. An appraisal advisory committee composed of appraisal staff, special education administrators, and other supportive positions (special education supervisors and counselors) be established.
2. This committee would be supported by release time and travel funds to meet as often as necessary to accomplish the objectives.
3. Each district or cluster would set up independent study groups to assist this committee in its work composed of local special education and regular education personnel as needed.
4. Outside consultants would be jointly funded to provide technical assistance to the sub-committees as needed.
5. A series of committees and sub-committees would be established as needed to reach the objectives set.
6. The final report of the appraisal advisory committee would be submitted to Region XX CASE for final approval.
7. A series of appraisal seminars would be held to dissent the results.

After much discussion and some real serious thought the following objectives were set for this activity:

1. To develop a model appraisal process for original entity into specail education.

2. To agree on a common set of eligibility standards for students being considered for special education entry.

3. To determine all known and anticipated legal requirements to incorporate into the appraisal process.

4. To reach an agreement on the testing procedures or list of tests to be used with non-English speaking students (primarily Mexican-American).

5. To provide a suggested set of forms to implement the appraisal process for consideration by each district or cluster.

6. To define the role and job description of each type of appraisal person in regards to the appraisal process.

7. To provide a model record transfer system between districts.

8. To present to the Texas Education Agency any recommendation(s) or finding(s) which would have state-wide impact.

This writer viewed this project as an excellent practicum prospect. As chairman of Region XX CASE and as the North East ISD Director of Special Education (officially Student Resources Director, since nurses and counselors are organizationally placed together with special education) of the second largest appraisal and special education department in the region, it would be possible to both guide and participate in this activity from beginning to end.

It was decided by this writer that the friendship and mutual respect built up over the years could result in participation in this project by personnel from other districts solely on the strength of helping this author achieve a completed practicum. Therefore, each part of the project was proposed and the participation of the various personnel was sought on the strength of need for the activity. No mention of the project as a practicum proposal was made. It was hoped that this withholding of discussion on this aspect would gain participation by persons truly interested in solving the issues of the appraisal process and not as a personal favor to the author.

Two members of Region XX CASE from small districts were asked to evaluate the practicum from beginning to end and to send Nova University a direct report on the role taken by this author in accomplishing this practicum. They both agreed to perform this function without discussion of this aspect of the project with others. The other person asked to evaluate this writer's role in this practicum is a fellow director in the district who has always had an interest in the appraisal process.

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER IV

The Practicum Design

All practicums must operate at two levels - the activity and the related events necessary for the practicum but not necessarily essential for the activity. This practicum has both of these elements plus a third. It was anticipated that this practicum would be open ended. Furuture plans and follow-up activities will be detailed in this report as part of the total practicum.

The basic structure of the activities were set by the membership of Region XX CASE when the appraisal process was agreed to as the project for the year. Many of these activities were modified during the course of the project as the reader will note in the next chapter of this report.

The practicum deals with a subject which could have regional, state, and even national significance. Developing a model appraisal system and record transfer system is essential to maintain public confidence in special education. It was from this frame of reference that the membership of Region XX CASE undertook the project.

The appraisal advisory committee was to be composed of a cross section of appraisal and special education supportive personnel representing all fifteen districts or clusters. This would insure input from personnel assigned to each of the fifty-one districts in the region. Committees and sub-committees were to be established to work on the various aspects of the project. In addition, local advisory committees were scheduled to be set up on a single purpose need basis to rpovide input to the members of the committees and sub-committees.

The activities were scheduled to achieve the objectives set for the project by Region XX CASE. A time-line was developed to findish the project by the middle of December, 1975. This date proved to be unrealistic.

Along with the activities of the Region XX project, this writer agreed to perform some additional activities. These included writing and field-testing a manual on the model appraisal process for original entity, evaluating the appraisal seminars, and writing a detailed plan for implementation of the model appraisal process.

As a part of the open ended aspect of this practicum this writer has agreed to:

1. Continue in the years to come to give leadership to gaining closer cooperation of all areas in the state in achieving a model appraisal process.
2. To leave detailed suggestions on how to implement the model appraisal plan for the Director of Student Resources to follow in the future whether the position is retained by the writer or filled by someone else.
3. To do a follow-up study on implementation on the results of this practicum between three to five years after its conclusion with a moral committment to put the findings into publishable form.

All expenses directly related to the project of Region XX CASE were to be borne by the individual districts or clusters. These were anticipated to be the bulk expense items of the practicum. Additional secretarial, copying, or physical facility assistance was to be secured when needed.

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER V

The Completion

Region XX is a huge land area measuring roughly 80 to 200 miles. Within this area are districts as small as 190 ADA (Utopia ISD) and as large as 65,000 ADA (San Antonio ISD). The Plan A staffing and funding implementation ranges from 103 percent of entitlement based on the Plan A statewide ADA formula (Alamo Heights ISD) to a low of 62 percent entitlement (South San Antonio ISD). The appraisal staffs found in the various districts range in quality as measured by degree and training from excellent (i.e. Northside's three Ph.D. psychologists) to guarded (as found by appraisal people holding positions for which they lack all of the necessary course work).

The appraisal advisory committee originally selected numbered 35 people. All but one cluster was represented on the original committee. Additinal personnel added for their expertise or personnel substituted for original members due to a variety of factors, raised the total number of committee members to over fifty during the year.

An organizational meeting was held in the large meeting room of the Stinson Field Special Education Center. This first meeting was hosted by Harlandale ISD and Cluster IV. This meeting was opened by Dr. Patricia Myers, Coordinator of Special Education and resident appraisal expert for Education Service Center, Region XX. She gave the overview of the project and stressed its importance. The writer chaired the meeting and guided the group in its deliberation.

The stated purpose of this first meeting was to form committees and to set a time line for the activities to follow. This was accomplished. The following committees were established:

1. Legal aspects
2. Forms and Record Transfer
3. Non-English Speaking
4. Staff Roles and Duties, and
5. Eligibility

The eligibility committee received the most attention and volunteers. The group decision was that most of the categories for special education eligibility were clearly defined in Bulletin 711 by the Texas Education Agency. Therefore, this committee would concentrate on the following eligibility categories:

1. Language and/or Learning Disabled (L/LD)
2. Emotionally Disturbed (ED)
3. Mentally Retarded (Trainable - TMR, Educable - EMR), and
4. Early Childhood (ages 3, 4, 5 - all categories)

The charge to the various committees was to meet briefly, exchange address and phone numbers, to agree on the date and place of their first meeting. A typical example of the seriousness with which this group approached the task, came at the end of this organizational meeting. After the data had been exchanged and the group adjourned, no one left the room for an hour or more even though it was past lunch time.

The first major departure from the original plan occured at the committee's organizational meeting. The eligibility committee decided to sub-divide into four committees each having a chairperson. The final report of this original committee became four separate reports; one each for language and/or learning disabled, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and early childhood education.

The Forms and Record Transfer Committee and the Legal Aspects Committee realized that their duties were intertwined. Thus, the two committees had several joint meetings. Their final report each carried similar titles but not the original title.

The Non-English Speaking Committee had a greater impact on the statewide appraisal effort than other committees. The Texas Education Agency was apparently so concerned that this committee not perform the task of determinine appraisal standard for the non-english students, that a task force was created by T.E.A. to achieve this purpose. The legislature had directed that T.E.A. perform this activity four years ago but until Region XX CASE created this committee no concrete action had occured.

The Staff Roles and Duties Committee failed to reach closure on their assignment. The committee concluded that there was no way that a recommendation regarding the roles of various staff members could be shown without creating some real resentment in several of the districts. The chairperson of the committee suggested that such a committee should be established several years from now after the clusters had had an opportunity to move closer together in the model appraisal process.

The schedule followed by the various committees depended upon their membership and assignment. All committees met individually in local cluster facilities during the working day. Released time and travel expenses were provided by the employing cluster or district as originally agreed. All typing, copying, and related needs were met by the clusters.

Trinity University in San Antonio sponsored the preliminary and final reports of the committees. These sessions were all day meetings with Region XX CASE members and committee members in attendance.

The Texas Education Agency made available their Chief Consultant for appraisal to attend and give suggestions at these reporting sessions. In addition this person arranged to meet with the Non-English Speaking Committee to give them an overview of the newly created T.E.A. task force.

Several unexpected aspects of the project developed. Originally, all clusters or districts agreed to pool resources to employ consultants where needed by committees for technical assistance. During the entire year no funds were expended for consultants due to voluntary assistance supplied by personnel already available to the committees (i.e. an attorney on a retainer by a district in the area gave advice to the Legal Aspects Committee). A paid consultant was secured for the seminar.

Another surprising development was the intensity of opinion various aspects of the appraisal process generated among certain individuals in the region. One would almost feel that pride of ownership was at stake in some of the decisions reached especially concerning forms.

The final phase of this project was an appraisal seminar held for the appraisal and administrative personnel of the region. A full week was set aside for this activity. An outside consultant was invited (Dr. Jack Harris - chairman of Special Education Department of Pan American University). He presented the findings of the composite of the committees, the model appraisal plan, and touched on related issues. Four meetings in four separate locations of the region were held to make it convenient for all persons interested in this activity to attend.

In addition to the Region XX CASE project another part of this practicum was conducted during this time period. A manual designed to eliminate the frustration of regular personnel was prepared and field tested. This manual was written to explain the appraisal process and answer the "red tape" concerns broadly held by regular educators.

A procedure to implement the model appraisal system was formulated to be used for implementation of this model in the writer's district as well as the rest of Region XX. This procedure is in reality a plan to gain uniformity in the appraisal process throughout the area.

Various aspects of the practicum was implemented during the formative stages of the committee activities. Thus, some results of the activity was noted during the course of the year.

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VI

Evaluation of Practicum

This practicum lends itself to evaluation procedures along several lines. Basically, the areas which can be evaluated are divided into three parts:

1. Process
2. Product, and
3. Effect

The process or activities conducted during this year is the heart of the practicum. These activities consumed the bulk of the year. The initial plan was so all encompassing that successful completion of the process alone should be given consideration in terms of educational leadership.

The product or what was produced is the body of the practicum. The concepts, procedures, paperwork, and agreements represent a new dimension to an entire area. These products could well stand alone in an evaluation design.

The effects or what has happened also needs attention. Here the issues become intolerably tangled and evaluation becomes difficult. Yet, there are effects which can be isolated sufficiently for examination.

This chapter will attempt to identify all three elements (process, product, and effect) and report the evaluative criteria applied to each. Each of the elements are interrelated and as such will require the reader's close attention to see the work as a whole. The various segments are isolated for the purpose of this chapter. Heavy dependence will be given to the appendix to show the concreteness of many of the statements made in this chapter.

The Process

Only the unique set of circumstances present in the Region XX area would allow such an ambitious undertaking as attempted by this practicum. The model is such that it provides for repetition elsewhere, if successful, because of the need of such an activity.

The proposal called for the establishment of objectives common to all of the fifty-one independent districts in the area through the cluster arrangement for special education purposes. This was accomplished through the agreement of the Region XX CASE (Council for Administrators of Special Education) membership.

Cooperation by a host of individuals was essential for the process to be completed. The practicum would have failed before it had begun if this cooperation was not provided. Since this was a multi-district effort no administrative edict of a single source was possible to gain the involvement necessary for the process to be effective. Since this practicum did not have independent funding, it relied not only on cooperation inthe form of agreement to the concept and procedures, but on monetary cooperation as well.

The following activities lend themselves to a measurement of the level of cooperation:

1. Staff to conduct the activities -

   All but one cluster had representatives assigned to the committees. All committees met on released time provided by the administration of the clusters. A total of fifty different individuals were involved at the committee level.

2. Clerical assistance -

   All typing and reproduction of material was provided by different clusters. Each committee or sub-committee chairperson produced the preliminary and final products for the consideration of the group as a whole.

3. Facility utilization -

   Ample small group meeting space was provided in a cluster facility for each of the committee meetings. Clusters or districts with meeting facilities large enough to accommodate larger groups were provided when the need arose. A local university (Trinity University of San Antonio) provided the facilities for the large group activities in order to insure that a neutral site was available.

4. Monetary support -

   Direct budget expenses were incurred by 100 percent of the clusters or districts during the course of this practicum. These included paper supplies, travel expenses, refreshments, honorariums, etc. All personnel participation in any aspect of the project was done with Administrative approval and with full pay.

5. Other staff -

   Dozens of non-appraisal personnel were involved in a variety of ways. Persons serving as principal, assistant principal, teacher, and other positions were found serving on special purpose local advisory committees, rating documents, and attending seminars.

The total man hours involved in this project are impossible for this writer to report accurately because of the many unknown variables. However, the conservative estimate given on following page may prove interesting to the reader.

		Hours
Steering Committee - eight meetings @ 6 hrs. each Region XX CASE members X 15 people each meeting		720
Committee members Group Meeting	three X 6 hrs. X 35 people	630
Individual meeting		600
Clerical time		100
Seminars	132 people X 6 hrs. each	792
Local appraisal conferences	15 clusters X 3 hrs. X 20 people (est.)	900
Estimated hours expended as result of this effort		3,742

To obtain this focus of attention on the appraisal process is indeed worth while even if no agreements on the concepts had been reached. Certainly the cooperation is a measure of the concern shown for the objectivities of this practicum.

A part of the process engaged in by this practicum was the need to answer certain concerns. While the implementation of some of the broad objectives have yet to be realized. The answers to all of the concerns, with one exception, were met.

The Product

The product as a result of this project can be evaluated in concrete form and to some extent in concept form. The appendix contains the concrete evidence and to some extent the concept evidence.

The stated objectives were met with written documents for consideration. These included the reports of the various committees, the suggested procedures in writing, and the other items required.

Each committee and sub-committee produced a written report. These reports were presented to the Steering Committee and defended by the committee chairperson.

The committee reports presented the recommendations addressed to the objectives.

1. The elements of common eligibility standards for special education categories
2. The legal protection suggestions
3. The model appraisal process procedure
4. The suggested set of forms to implement a common appraisal system, and
5. The method to standardize the transfer of records between districts

Each of the committee reports was accepted by Region XX CASE. This approval meant acceptance of the product. Since the committee reports were submitted to line by line examination the condition of a formative evaluation was present. At the seminar stage the committee reports were presented as a package and rated as such. This procedure meets the test of a summative evaluation.

One product was prepared exclusively for use within the writer's district even though copies were made available for use in other clusters. This was a manual fully explaining the model appraisal process following the recommended flow chart of the appraisal advisory committee. This manual was field-tested by sending it to a wide representative population of professionals in the Region XX area. Over 100 copies of this manual was distributed as such. Rating scales and addressed envelopes were enclosed. Eighty-four percent returned the rating scale.

One unique feature of this manual is that it does not rely on rules and regulations to explain the appraisal process. Instead it relies on logic to explain and justify the procedures used from original referral until placement in special education.

Originally the manual was conceived to explain the rules, regulations and legal needs associated with the appraisal process. The decision to produce a manual which presented an appraisal process based on logic and need, was in response to a finding by the appraisal advisory committee. Many regular educators were deeply concerned if not resentful regarding the rules and regulations concerned with special education original placement.

Thus, special education administrators were caught in a trap. They had to follow rules, regulations, and legal procedures while trying to satisfy regular educators who did not like or understand all of the "red tape." This manual attempted to meet this need by attacking the objections to rules and regulations but defending the appraisal process as logical and in the best interest of students.

The field testing indicates that the manual does meet this need. This product was not viewed as needed prior to start of the practicum.

One major activity that was part of the agreed upon process was the appraisal awareness seminar held as a conclusion of the year's effort. This seminar is listed in the product section for evaluation purposes.

The seminars were conducted by Dr. Jack Harris, Chairman of the Special Education Department of Pan American University in Edinburg, Texas. He was selected to conduct these sessions since he had the professional background needed to handle the content area, the personal experience to address the administrative issues, the title to gain acceptance, and he was not previously associated with any group or concern within the Region XX area. Dr. Harris is an educational psychologist who has had practical experience as a local special education director in Texas. Since he had no vested interest in the project, any district, or acitivity in the region he was reasonably free from bias concerning the stated objectives or the proposed solution.

Four seminars were conducted in four widely separated parts of the region. The attendance included appraisal personnel for the most part, not associated with the project by being on a committee, administrative personnel interested enough to attend, and a sprinkling of other professionals, including a couple of psychologist of the area in private practice.

The seminars were evaluated by the persons in attendance. In addition to the usual questions, the participants were asked to react to a wide range of questions concerning the activities of the year to date. This technique also allowed for the gathering of some information regarding the objectives of the project. Questions 8 - 14 on the evaluation form all addressed issues which were much broader than the seminar itself. The complete evaluation scale can be found in the appendix.

Several conclusions can be reached as a result of the evaluation of the seminars. First, and possibly most important, the response receiving the highest rating was #2 (4.6) which asked whether their attendance was an expression of interest in the appraisal process. The apparent interest by such a wide population clearly indicates the importance of the appraisal process in the minds of many of the educational leaders in this area.

The item which shows the only negative response #12 (2.9), was to be expected. It asked if the project "has had any impact on the appraisal process in your district/cluster?" Much of the audience at these seminars was composed of educators who do not deal with the operational decisions concerning the inner workings of the appraisal process. Thus, it is possible that they failed to see changes in eligibility standards as a direct result of this year-long effort. It is also possible that changes implemented were done to appear as a local process to make them more politically acceptable. It is also possible that the project has had limited impact.

For statistical purposes anything less than 3.0 on a 5 point scale would be viewed as a negative response. It should be pointed out that nearly 50 percent of the persons in attendance did rate item #12 at least 3.0 or above, indicating that some impact has been noted.

Item 9 (3.9) is another resonse which raises serious questions on the success of the project. Item 9 asked for an opinion on whether common appraisal forms should be adopted throughout the region. A positive response to this item is highly significant when one realizes the "pride of ownership" encountered so often during the year of the project, whenever forms were mentioned. Realistically, it will be several years before this aspect will be fully implemented if ever.

The evaluation of the Appraisal Awareness Seminar was summative in nature. The attempt was to measure the seminar and the objectives of the whole practicum as reflected in the process and product.

The table on the following page shows the results of the questionnaire presented to those in attendance at these seminars. Representation by personnel from all 15 clusters is reflected in these totals. Arithmetic means were calculated on each item for those present at each location. Means were then calculated for a composit of the region. North refers to the districts in attendance at the seminar held in Northside ISD administration conference room and attended by those districts better able to reach that location. East refers to the seminar in the old board room of the North East ISD and the attending districts. South refers to the meeting in the South San Antonio ISD board room. Uvalde refers to the meeting conducted in the First State Bank's meeting room in Uvalde, Texas. The scale used was from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).

ITEMS	NORTH N=12	EAST N=50	SOUTH N=38	UVALDE N=32	TOTAL N=132
1	4.2	3.8	3.9	2.8	3.6
2	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.6
3	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.5
4	5.0	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.5
5	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.3
6	4.6	4.2	3.7	4.3	4.1
7	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9
8	4.0	4.4	3.9	3.5	4.0
9	3.6	4.3	3.8	3.5	3.9
10	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.8
11	3.7	3.4	3.9	3.0	3.5
12	3.2	3.4	2.7	2.4	2.9
13	3.2	4.0	4.1	3.5	3.9
14	4.2	4.5	4.2	3.8	4.2

Item 8 (4.0) dealt with the need for regionwide common elegibility criteria. This favorable response lends support to the expectation of its broad implementation. An analysis of individual rating forms indicated a definite pattern of strong support or very negative response with very few responses in the middle range of 3. Thus, while there is strong support to implement common eligible standards there are several individuals in the area who do not view this as a desirable end product.

Regardless of any disagreement on the need for a common appraisal process, eligibility standards, or forms; the seminar participants individually and collectively favored by 4.2 item 14 which asked if the efforts of the committee would be shared with other sections of the State. This belief that what the appraisal adivisory committee had generated should be shared with other portions of the State held promise for its acceptance within the region.

The question of legal action related to the appraisal process was a real concern and a motivation factor behind much of the work done by the committee. There should be a long range impact noted in this area. In addition some short range effects can be noted.

As previously stated the recommendations regarding uniform appraisal standards have been very well received. The use of the of the DSM II manual for the category of the emotionally disturbed and the use of the mental age for the L/LD category are the two main examples. These are now in use in all of the clusters within the region. In addition, specific recommendations were made regarding uniform standards for the mentally retarded. These recommendations were more explanations than changes. They did present concrete interpretations to the vastness noted in T.E.A. guidelines. The indication is that these interpretations are being accepted and implemented throughout the region.

The long range effect of this broad based acceptance of uniform eligibility standards in the legal area is clear. Evaluation of students, in a similar fashion with similar criteria in all the districts in a given area, is the best defense possible against unfair charges lodged against a single district in an individual case. An attorney's opinion on the matter stated that the doctrine of common practices is the best defense against individual challenges. Thus, uniform eligibility standards should prove helpful in this regard.

The suggested set of sample forms will not likely be implemented throughout the district. However, every district now has a release of information and a request for information form. These forms are required by both State and Federal regulations.

The model appraisal process flow chart written from a legal framework gives the due process protection and students rights safeguards to follow. This process is designed to protect against law suits.

A flow chart similar to the one recommended by the appraisal advisory committee is now in use in all the clusters/districts. However, many of the districts have not had to revise their flow charts since they were already using a flow chart equal to the one proposed.

The Effect

Measuring the effect of any activity in education can be difficult and oftentimes subjective. Even apparent achievement gains can be the result of factors other than the treatment introduced.

Measuring the effect of this practicum on students is very difficult since it is primarily aimed at a process which affects students and not all the students themselves.

The vastness of the area and the inability of this writer to collect hard data from other districts or clusters makes the effect section of this report somewhat incomplete. The effect result of this practicum will be reported as objective as possible.

It should be noted that the product has been implemented in several districts during the process stage. For example, feed back on eligibility standards being proposed led to their adoption in some districts before the final committee report. It is relatively simple to see the successful aspects of the process and the product, but it is another matter to demonstrate the effect. However, there exists some results which can be attributed to this year's activity.

One of the most interesting aspects of the practicum was to perform a task delegated by law to the Texas Education Agency. The original project called for the Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee to recommend a list of tests or a procedure to follow to appraise non-English speaking students.

The legislature had enacted a statute which required non-bias appraisal for non-English speaking students. It was only after the formation of this sub-committee by Region XX CASE that the Special Education Division of the Texas Education Agency established a task force to meet this four year old demand by the legislative branch of the Texas governmental system.

The agency task force completed its work about the same time as the Region XX project was completed. The agency's efforts were adopted on April 10, 1976 as state board policy applicable to the entire State. While this writer would not be so presumptuous as to claim credit for causing T.E.A. to act - the circumstances do indicate that perhaps there may be some correlation.

Now there is a policy with information sufficient to insure that all non-English speaking students will be assessed uniformly throughout the State. The net effect of this will be to insure that all non-English speaking students receive an opportunity to be placed or not be placed, in special education based on their unique needs and not on personal whims.

The effects on the Region XX area of the product produced by this year's activity are revealed in several ways. The list generated naming the person responsible for providing records from each of the 51 districts in the region on transferring students should prove time saving. This list was a direct result of a recommendation made by the Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee. The staff of Region XX, Education Service Center gathered the information, compiled the list and distributed it to each district in the region. This list will have the effect of speeding the transfer of records between districts on students changing locations.

Evaluation of the impact of this new procedure is most difficult to qualify. The problem arose on an opinion level when several directors reported frustration over the length of time necessary to obtain records from other districts even within the region.

The list giving the contact person to secure records produced some surprises. Several of the larger clusters or districts listed a name completely unfamiliar to the majority of special education directors in the area. Most districts have someone charged with the responsibility of record transfer. Contacting the director's office or anyone else other than the person responsible for this operation is a built in delay.

The list of the contact person for securing records is part of the total package of recommendations made by the committee. Included, as a part of the record transfer system is the method and the forms necessary as a result of the Family Rights and Privacy Act and other regulations. This total system will insure faster service to students moving from one district to another within the region.

Since the list was published, the length of time necessary to secure records has been noticeably shorter. This is the opinion of five directors who have experienced receiving new students from within the region since the new procedures were suggested and the list was published. The Coordinator of Special Education for Education Service Center, Region XX reports an apparent easing of the time delay in the last several weeks. However, the change in the situation may be due to increased attention and not to the activities described.

Another noticeable effect with region-wide implications is the removal of time delays on accepting students moving from one district to another district. This is due to the wide spread acceptance of the common eligibility standards for the emotionally disturbed category and the language and/or learning disability category proposed by the committee. With districts using the same standards it is possible to accept the testing done by another district in the region without the need for additional testing.

The majority of districts or clusters now have "mental" age as the standard interpretation of the requirement for a difference between age and achievement for L/LD eligibility. This means a student can be A.R.D.'d at once upon receipt of records without having to establish this difference.

Prior to the project several districts used chronological age as the basis for this difference. Thus, if a district using chronological age received a student labeled L/LD from a district using mental age the student would be either ineligible for service or would require additional testing. Before the project, mental age was the standard used in about 35 percent of the clusters. It is now the standard in all districts (except chronological age is still acceptable if in the opinion of the examiner this is the best indicator - i.e. very young children.)

This writers district used chronological age prior to the project while the three districts most likely to receive its students did not. Thus, on several occasions complaints were received back from parents with L/LD students who could not get readily accepted in their new district. This problem has ceased to exist. Thus, students living in the author's district can be assured that the L/LD eligibility, once established, will be valid at least in the districts east, south and west of the writer's district. (Immediately north of this district begins a new regional service center area.)

With the advent of the Family Rights and Privacy Act all reports and records became availabel to parental inspection. This reaulted in almost immediate changes in psychological reports. Reports before the Act's passage would speak of psychiatric problems, parental shortcomings, and would tend to state plainly both the diagnosis and prognosis. Reports received after the Act's passage generally would use such language as "reaction to environment" or socially unacceptable behavior. These new terms tended to protect the feelings of parents and perhaps the examiner from suits, but left a receiving district with no concrete information with which to plan a program for the student. The recommendation of the eligibility committee gave the protection to the parent's feelings and the examiner's professional standing by use of the categories by number as given in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, second edition (DSM II), published by the American Psychiatric Association. The receiving district now has the statement to meet the eligibility standards and the source book to interpret the report for programs purposes.

This will speed up placement of E.D. students being transferred. It should improve the educational services they receive in their home district as well. It certainly makes the psychologist more likely to label a specific category of emotional disturbance when it does not have to be spelled out in detail for parental review. The technical manual is written in such a manner that special education personnel trained in the area of the emotionally disturbed can read the code explanation clearly enough to proceed on a educational plan to meet the needs of the student.

Measurement of this anticipated outcome is difficult but not impossible. Approximately 70 percent of the districts in the region and many of the psychiatrists and psychologists in private practice have adopted this method of reporting. Consequently, during the last five months there have been no students found ineligible on the records provided those students referred for the educational program at Villa Rosa Hospital emotionally disturbed unit operated by this writers district. Referrals were made either on testing done at the hospital or testing provided the hospital by the sending district.

The previous experience was that at least one student a month, referred for the school inside the hospital, would not meet the eligibility standards due to that students condition or his records not substantiating the emotional disturbance necessary to obtain educational placement. Thus, all 84 students A.R.D.'d in the last five months at that facility met the standards and were placed.

The short range picture regarding legal action is difficult to credit to the practicum. Contrary to earlier years, there is not a single lawsuit or federal agency investigation involving the placement or denial of placement of a student in special education in the entire region. The spectrum of lawsuits and the reality of H.E.W. investigations has been so frequent in the area the last five years, that local caution may well be responsible for the picture today. This writer does defend the premise that the ground work prior to the formal activities of this practicum and the product of this practicum have contributed to the reduction to zero of special education related legal action. This contention is based on the findings that there are several legal actions in progress throughout the area regarding regular students, minority questions, student fees, health issues, discipline cases, and hiring practices. Surely the administrators in other programs outside of special education have had the same general knowledge of the legal climate, yet it is in areas outside of special education where these problems are in litigation.

The only known legal action being undertaken at this time by the Texas Education Agency regarding accrediatation in the region is confined to two school districts. The announced preliminary findings in both cases made no mention of any problems connected with the special education operation in those districts.

The summary of legal aspects of this practicum is that while no direct correlation can be proved between the practicum activities and the lack of any legal action affecting special education appraisal or programs in the region, an assumption can be made that appears to have been successful. Furthermore, the recommendations contained within the practicum will provide mutual protection against legal action in the future.

In the writer's home district several effects of this practicum have been noted which are worth mentioning. Direct correlation with changes in outcome to the practicum produced will be shown where applicable.

The time line of the practicum was such that events occuring during the course of the year often became translated into useful products in the writer's home district before they became final products for consideration by the rest of the region.

The effect on administrative procedures, on what happend to students and measurable changes in actual practice are easier to measure in this one district cluster than on the region as a whole. The writer's district has over two hundred special education teachers with a large experienced appraisal staff. Thus, the impact of this practicum in one district should serve as a guide of expectancy for other similar districts or clusters in this region or the State.

The first main change noted was the introduction of the use of eligibility standards which were to later be introduced as the final recommendation of the Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee. The three principal categories were Language and/or Learning Disabilities, Emotionally Disturbed, and Mentally Retarded.

The more exact criteria for placement required for the educable mentally retarded has resulted in a drop in the number of students found eligible for that program. The standards applied to students referred for possible placement have resulted in a reduction of students requiring the services of that program at the elementary level.

The students referred for appraisal for possible entry into that program resulted in a positive placement rate of 46 percent as compared with an average positive placement rate of 69 percent in the two previous years. The reevaluation and review of presently placed students shows a change in classification (from M.R. to L/LD) slightly higher than that noted in the previous two years. but not high enough to be statistically sufficient.

The use of better eligibility standards for the mentally retarded has resulted in fewer improperly placed students, a net reduction in the number of elementary age M.R. students, and a change in the number of teacher units necessary to continue that program for the 1976-77 school year. It appears that one teacher can be reassigned from the elementary M.R. program to some other special education program for 1976-77. No changes have been observed in secondary E.M.R. programs as a result of the effort.

The change in eligibility standards for L/LD is very significant. The overall impact has been to increase the numbers of students rather than reduce the number. This is a positive finding directly attributed to several factors.

The use of mental age, rather than chronological age, tends to increase the likelihood of eligibility at the earlier ages (elementary) and decrease the likelihood at older ages (secondary). This has resulted in more elementary age placements than noted in previous years.

The shifting of M.R. students referrals to L/LD classifications based on the new standards was not unexpected. Since L/LD is more acceptable by parents this has resulted in fewer rejections of service by parents.

The L/LD criteria in operation in previous years tended to make placement easier for secondary students. It was decided that all seniors and most juniors placed on earlier criteria would not be reevaluated under the new criteria.

While the mental age standard is more restrictive than previous criteria for secondary students,the other criteria is not. It appears easier to verify process deficits, achievement levels (as expressed in basic academics), and deviations in learning style for secondary students than for elementary age students. The number of secondary eligible students in the L/LD program increased over the numbers from last year. The percent of increased is down but this is contributed to the establishment of secondary programs for L/LD in the secondary schools over the last three years in this district and not the appraisal efforts as such.

The eligibility standards for the emotionally disturbed have resulted in a better quality and a lower quantity of referrals. Center School, a school for emotionally disturbed secondary students - operated by this writer's department, has reported this findings.

Last year (1974-75) Center School reached a capacity enrollment of students in January. This year (1975-76) the capacity has yet to be reached (April 1976). An analysis of students indicate more students enrolled this year are classified emotionally disturbed on exact standards than ever before. One-third of the students (43 out of 126 campus students) are under treatment by a private psychologist or psychiatrist. This compares to a high of one-fourth in private treatment (1973-74) over the past four years. Since private therapy is at the expense of parents it is reasonable to assume that more real E.D. students are enrolled there this year.

The eligibility standards for emotionally disturbed developed as a product of the practicum may not be the cause for this incresed enrollment of bonafide E.D. students. Another cause may be the process of this practicum and the long range effects of a previous practicum conducted by this writer. The district's four high schools were involved in moving Center School from a purely alternative school to a transitional school (1973-74 mini-practicum). The involvement of the regular high school leadership in the selection of students and in the operation of Center School has established excellent communication lines. The process of developing a product for this practicum (1975-76) involved some of this same personnel. The net result has been that the regular high schools have become more sophisticated in predeterminating students who would qualify for enrollment at Center School.

The time lag has been reduced dramatically for enrollment in Center School. This time lag has been reduced from an average of six weeks to less than two weeks from initial referral to enrollment. This is a result of better referrals (the current practicum), closer communication (previous practicum), and no waiting list due to a better understanding of the appraisal process (again the current practicum).

The time lag has been reduced also for special eucation services on the regular high school campuses. The exact time frame has proved to be impossible to measure because of lack of hard data generated at the secondary level in previous years. Secondary counselors report this reduction in time is necessary for services to begin.

A significant product contribution for use in the writer's home district has been the publication of a manual (previously cited under the product section) describing the appraisal process. This manual was written, field tested, revised and disseminated to the leadership of the district. It has met with measurable success. In addition to explaining the appraisal process it has several procedures explained which have resulted in behavior changes. An example is an explanation in the manual about the role of the administrator in the appraisal process. This has resulted in two secondary schools assigning administrators to the A.R.D. committee which had not done so previously.

Another example of behavior change is the unanimous way the six middle schools have found adequate places for testing students on their campuses. This need was presented very strongly in the manual. As a result one middle school principal who had never seen this as a need suddenly found an appropriate testing room on his campus after he was asked to read the rough draft of the manual as part of the field testing.

One of the recommendations of the Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee was the role that regular teachers should assume at the A.R.D. committee when the question of continuation of L/LD students was discussed. It was recognized that definite improvements could be experienced without the student being able to manage in the regular classroom without supportive help. This meant that the appraisal people could see the need to give greater weight to classroom behavior than to testing behavior to determine continuation in the resource L/LD program. This change was made in the writer's district (November 75). As a result,no students were dismissed from the L/LD program at the elementary level solely as a result of formal testing data when the classroom teachers felt strongly that the student should continue in placement.

CHAPTER VII

CHAPTER VII

Summary of Evaluation

The process was unquestionably successful. The cooperation in staff time, clerical assistance, monetary support, and use of facilities exceeded expectations.

The product produced was clear, concise, and very positive. The only failure experienced was in the area of accepting a set of common forms which may prove to be too much to achieve, given the "pride of ownership" found in the area of forms.

The effect will be both short range and long range. In the short range there has been a complete cessation of legal action concerning special education matters with reasonable belief that the long range effects will be as dramatic should legal action arise. Measurable shortening of time delays have been noted between districts transferring students due to both a better record transfer system and a standardization of certain eligibility criteria.

The effects on the writer's district have been many and dramatic. These include a reduction in staff needed for the elementary M.R. program, a better quality of referrals to the district's two E. D. facilities, some behavior change noted as a result of the manual, and continuation of service to students who would have been dismissed previously.

CHAPTER VIII

CHAPTER VIII

Importance of the Practicum
(Further Application)

The importance of proper appraisal in assigning students to special education is a national concern. The pros and cons on the amount of, kind of, timing of, and reporting of appraisals are found in popular lay magazines as well as technical journals and professional papers. Nearly every state legislature and lately the national congress have passed laws on this topic. Special education with some standards tied to the appraisal process is the operational procedure in every State in the Union.

There still remains much disagreement on all aspects of the process even in areas as advanced as Texas is in special education. The need for appraisal personnel to band together to present some uniformity to the system appears necessary to even a casual observer.

This practicum presents a plan for a process which could be followed by any group of special educators faced with a need to present solutions to appraisal related matters. For the convience of the reader the process is briefly outlined below in squential steps.

1. An organized group of special educators is the best platform to study special education needs. These exist in many regions of the nation and should be formed where they are missing.
2. The broad issues should be presented to the group to allow for some consensus of need.
3. These needs or problems should be identified in precise language.

4. A group (committee/committees) representing the whole should be formed to propose solutions to meet the needs.
5. The solutions should be presented back to the original group for reaction and action.
6. The findings should be implemented where feasible.

Hopefully, regions or areas within States can reach agreement on terms, procedures, and needs which allow for professional appraisal services for special education students. It appears likely that such uniformity will be essential as Public Law 94-142 (Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975) moves into greater importance by providing increased funding of federal dollars to State special education programs. It might prove to be very unworkable to allow the appraisal process to be dictated from Washington. This is a real possibility if the strictly local interpretations of existing State guidelines are as widespread across the nation as it was in this area prior to this practicum.

Appendix Overview

The items included in this section are essential to a full understanding of this practicum. The items are organized to present the reader with the sequence following the sequence of the practicum. That is process, product, and effect.

The first group of items are the various memos sent out by the Region XX CASE chairman (the practicum writer). These memos are provided to give the reader a clearer understanding of how the practicum was explained to the various appraisal personnel and others of the area associated with the project. Included under the process aspect of the practicum is the memo from Region XX asking for the name of the person from each district to serve as a contact person for records on a student transferring between districts.

The product part of the practicum is by far the largest part of the appendix. Here is the report of the five committees which were committees and sub-committees of the Appraisal Advisory Committee of Region XX CASE.

The group of committee reports are the final product of those committees. The preliminary reports are not included because it would serve no useful purpose. These reports were adopted by Region XX CASE as its final product.

The set of suggested forms is the final draft of the committee assigned that task. Even though the set was adopted it does not appear likely that the districts will ever adopt a uniform set of forms for reasoning stated in the practicum report.

The results of the survey providing all of the contact persons listed by district (all 51) is included to demonstrate how important such a list can be. A good illustration is the D'Hanis ISD. If a student transfers from that district the list shows that to obtain the special education records you contact a Mr. Joe Farris in Uvalde.

The evaluation form of the Appraisal Awareness Seminar could have been located under the process section of this appendix since it was part of the process. Since the purpose of the seminar was to present the product of the year's effort it is presented here.

Also presented in the product section of the appendix is the manual developed for the writer's home district. Following the original manual is the field testing instrument and the results of that field testing. The final part of that effort is a shortened version of the manual to meet the personal suggestions of several persons who read the original manual as part of the field testing.

The new state board policy, passed on April 10, 1976, is reproduced under the effects section of this appendix. It is presented here for reasons already given in the body of this report.

For the readers convience each appendix is number seperately and titled.

APPENDIX I

Organizational Meeting and Plan

REGION XX CASE

Region XX Council of Administrators of Special Education

San Antonio, Texas

September 2, 1975

MEMO TO: Region XX CASE Members

FROM: Preston C. Stephens, Chairman

SUJBECT: 1st Meeting 75 - 76

The September meeting of the Region XX CASE will be held at North East Independent School District, in the Board Room of the Administrative Building, 10333 Broadway, San Antonio, Texas.

DATE: September 5, 1975 - Friday

TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

The agenda will include:

- Developing a Model on Appraisal for consideration in each district in the Region XX area.
- Answering unanswerable questions.
- Preparations for legislature involvement 2 years from now.

Please make plans to attend!

DEVELOPING A PLAN

This project will occur in the Education Service Center, Region XX area. It will involve representatives from most of the major districts and special education cooperatives of the region. This will include the author's home district, the North East Independent School District.

The official organization known as the Region XX Council of Administrators for Special Education (Region XX CASE) will sponsor the project. The individual districts they represent will provide any funding needed to insure successful conclusion of the activities. Released time with pay will be provided to all staff personnel necessary to assist with the activities.

The membership of Region XX CASE will serve as the steering committee for this project. This group will make all decisions on the activities to be pursued and the final product developed.

An advisory committee will be formed composed of appraisal, administrative, and other staff personnel of the region. Each major district of the region will be invited to supply persons for this committee. The numbers and types of staff represented will be that decided by the steering committee. It is felt that this would be a committee of less than thirty, but more than fifteen, persons all employed by the various independent school districts in the region.

This advisory committee would be expected to sub-divide into smaller committees to work on various aspects of this project. One or more persons for example would need to be designated to contact other districts to get their forms, policies, and procedures for study.

The advisory committee would receive secretarial assistance and meeting space from North East Independent School District. Other districts would provide released time, mileage funds, and secretarial assistance as needed.

Each major district engaged in this project would be expected to form a local appraisal and records advisory committee. These local committees would provide input to the region-wide advisory committee and could serve as a sounding board for suggestions from the region-wide committee.

Finally, a panel of experts representing both appraisal and administration would be appointed. This panel's expertise would be applied wherever it was needed. This panel of experts would assist with technical knowledge in: special education areas, evaluation, procedures and requirements, legal questions, and procedural matters.

The primary objective of this project is to achieve a closer degree of uniformity among the districts in Region XX in regard to interpretations of rules and operational procedures concerning special education, appraisal and record keeping. A second objective is to prepare something that would be applicable to other parts of the state.

Development of local policies, regulations, forms, and procedures would be meaningless unless they were implemented. To insure this, a development seminar(s) would be scheduled for all appraisal and special education administrators in the region. One or more of the panel of experts would be invited to appear on this seminar(s).

A booklet of forms for each district's consideration would be developed. This booklet of forms would be expected to serve as a guide for all districts in the region. It is likely that most of the districts would adopt the majority of the forms for their use.

A manual would be developed for use by the special education administrators of the region. This manual would provide the procedures and other items as stated on the handout.

Each superintendent and board member of the region would have access to the finished product. They would also be invited to participate in the activities where appropriate.

The success of this project can easily be measured by application of the finished product. If one or more districts accepts the:

1. Definitions of eligibility standards for special education categories and method of determining that eligibility,
2. The list of tests or the procedure to use to appraise non-English speaking students,
3. The forms suggested for the appraisal process and,
4. If two or more districts agree on a common record transfer system
5. If other region centers or districts therein adopt any or all of these concepts; then, the project would definitely be successful.

APPENDIX II

Second Organizational Meeting

REGION XX CA

Region XX Council of Administrators of Spec
Education

San Antonio, Texas

September 11, 1975

MEMO TO: Region XX CASE Members

FROM: Preston C. Stephens, Chairman

SUBJECT: September 17th Meeting

Just a reminder the next meeting of the Region XX CASE members will be held at the Student Activity Center, North East I.S.D. on September 17, 1975 (Wednesday) 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.

The Student Center is located on the same site as the Blossom Athletic Center with the entrance on Starcrest Drive. Starcrest Drive runs between Jones-Maltsberger Road and Wetmore Road as noted on the enclosed map.

This meeting will be to decide:

A. What are the appraisal issues that should be addressed.
B. The size and composition of the Appraisal Advisory Committee.
C. The schedule that will be followed.
D. Suggestions for the Panel of Experts.

SAN ANTONIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
141 LAVACA STREET
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78210

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

September 12, 1975

Mr. Preston C. Stephens, Chairman
Region XX CASE
c/o North East Independent School District
10333 Broadway
San Antonio, Texas 78286

Dear Preston:

I regret that I will not be able to attend the meeting on the 17th as I am attending a District workshop. If possible, I will send one of the supervisors.

Preston, since I will not be at the meeting please let me convey the following. I am in total accord with the goals of the proposed project. However, due to financial and other needed resources I feel that this is a project that should be carried out by Region 20. Its importance and its magnitude warrants the assistance that an organization like Region 20 can render. I would appreciate if this viewpoint is presented and considered by the group.

I am sorry that I will not be in attendance.

Sincerely,

Janie

Janie Obregon,
Director
Special Education

JO:mlb

cc: Dr. Patricia Myers
Director of Special Education
Education Service Center, Region 20

APPRAISAL NEEDS

1. Develop a common definition of eligibility criteria for each category of special education service.

2. Organize a model appraisal delivery system to meet all known and anticipated legal requirements.

3. Define the roles and procedures of the various staff positions in regard to referrals, screening, evaluations, placements, writing educational plans, follow-up and termination of services.

4. Provide a systematic procedure to protect the rights of parents, minority students, other students, and the professional staff.

5. Select and reach agreement on a standarized list of individual evaluation instruments to be used with non-English speaking students or develop recommended procedures to follow in meeting this need.

6. Develop a model record transfer system between districts.

7. Provide suggested forms to be available to implement every aspect of the appraisal process.

8. Give input to the Texas Education Agency on possible revisions needed in special education operational procedures regarding the appraisal process.

Changes recommended in #1 - 8 above:

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

Additional areas of concern:

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX III

Example of Year's Continuing Meetings

REGION XX CASE

Region XX Council of Administrators of Special Education

San Antonio, Texas

January 15, 1976

Region XX CASE - - - - - - - Meeting

WHEN: January 27, 1976 -- 8:30 - 12:00 noon

WHERE: North East ISD - New Board Room

WHY: (See Agenda)

WHO: As Usual

AGENDA

8:30 - 9:00 am Bexar County Administrators -

To discuss rumors which state that placing students in non-public agencies under contract authority, will be eliminated next year.

9:00 - 12:00 noon All Members -

1. TCASE meeting and our role.
2. Legislative hearing to be held in San Antonio on Special Education.
3. Setting up a meeting with State Representative Albert Brown.
4. Finishing Appraisal Committee's work.
5. Developing a position on Special Education funding.
6. Catharsis

Preston C. Stephens, Chairman

APPENDIX IV

Appraisal Awareness Seminars

REGION XX CASE

Region XX Council of Administrators of Special Education

San Antonio, Texas

March 17, 1976

MEMO TO: Region XX CASE Members

FROM: Preston C. Stephens, Chairman P.S.

SUBJECT: Revised Schedule - Appraisal Awareness Conference

This revised schedule of the Appraisal Awareness Conference is being sent to you as a reminder of the meetings and to give you some additional details. These announcements are NOT being sent to individual appraisal personnel. Who will attend and which meeting they attend, is your decision.

The following schedule shows the information needed for attending these meetings. However, the districts or clusters shown are suggested only. If you would prefer to have all or part of your staff attend a different session, please feel free to have them do so. It will be necessary to call Bob McNeil in Uvalde if you are planning to send someone to that particular meeting. His group will have a catered lunch and he needs a count.

Scheduled time is for all sessions: 9:00 am - 3:30 pm

DATE	PLACE	DISTRICTS/CLUSTERS
Tuesday March 23	Old Board Room Student Resource Bldg. North East ISD San Antonio, Texas	Alamo Heights ISD Military Cooperative San Antonio ISD North East ISD
Wednesday March 24	Board Room So. San Antonio ISD 2515 Sioux Street San Antonio, Texas	Cluster IV - Harlandale ISD Southwest ISD Edgewood ISD So. San Antonio ISD
Thursday March 25	McAnnalee Room First State Bank Uvalde, Texas	Hondo ISD Pearsall ISD Uvalde ISD
Friday March 26	Conference Room 2nd floor - Admin. Bldg. Northside ISD 5900 Evers Road San Antonio, Texas	Northside ISD East Central ISD Judson ISD Kerrville ISD

APPENDIX V

Example of Early Sub-Committee Report

North East Independent School District
10333 BROADWAY - SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78286

DEPARTMENT OF
STUDENT RESOURCES

Counseling & Guidance
Health Services
Appraisal Services
Special Instruction
Center School

January 20, 1976

MEMO TO: Mr. Preston C. Stephens, Chairman Region XX CASE

FROM: James Bode, Chairman Region XX CASE LLD Subcommittee

SUBJECT: LLD Subcommittee Report

Attached is the report of the Region XX CASE LLD Subcommittee. The report is divided into thhree sections.

The first section deals with interpretation of TEA guidelines for LLD placement. One of the major issues dealt with here is whether "age level expectancy" should be mental age, chronological age, or a combination of the two. In determining what interpretation is used by appraisal personnel in Region XX, we found that in the majority of districts, the mental age concept is used, and this is what the subcommittee is recommending.

The second section covers additional topics related to the appraisal process. Included are certain aspects of the Speech and Hearing Category, MBI criteria and the comprehensive reappraisal for LLD placement. In the third section, "Items for Discussion," we propose that TEA be asked to modify its policy regarding the physicals required for LLD placement. We are also recommending that the Region XX CASE establish a separate subcommittee for Speech, Language and Hearing Services. In addition, we are suggesting that each district consider developing specific criteria for dismissal from the LLD program.

I want to thank you for the outstanding leadership you have demonstrated in establishing the Appraisal Advisory Committee. Also, I would like to commend the members of the LLD Subcommittee for their diligence and hard work in dealing with the assigned topics.

APPRAISAL OF LANGUAGE AND/OR LEARNING DISABILITIES
Proposed Interpretation of Guidelines

Within the general Texas Education Agency guidelines for establishing LLD eligibility, as outlined in Bulletin 711, the following interpretation and definition has been developed by the Region XX CASE Appraisal Advisory Subcommittee on LLD and is submitted for consideration.

Texas Education Agency Criteria (Bulletin #711)

(1) Written report of assessment showing total intellectual functioning not more than two standard deviation units below the norm.

(2) A written report of assessment revealing evidence of a deficit or deficits in one or more of the basic psychological learning processes of auditory, visual or haptic processing, intersensory integration and/or concept formation.

(3) A written report of educational assessment substantiating a discrepancy between age level expectancy and current educational performance. This criterion may not necessarily apply to pupils ages 3 through 5 years of age.

(4) Documented evidence must be offered to indicate that the child's learning style deviates so markedly from the norm of his age group that he requires Special Education intervention.

(5) Physician's written report of general medical evaluation.

Proposed Interpretation of Guidelines:

(1) Total intellectual functioning should be represented by a score not more than two standard deviation units below the norm on recognized, standardized individual test(s) of global intellectual development. The examiner should use careful judgement in determining the child's potential or mental age level expectancy, particularly where the potential is estimated to be higher than test scores indicate. The score derived from such standardized tests as well as documented, clinical evidence may be used to determine a child's potential or mental age level expectancy.

(2) The appraisal person must document through formal and/or informal testing, and observations during testing and/or in the classroom, one or more deficits in the basic psychological learning processes which would cause a reduction in academic performance. Auditory and visual acuity are not considered process deficits. (See eligibility criteria #5).

The following are examples and are not meant to be all inclusive:

Auditory processing may include, for example, auditory memory, auditory sequencing, auditory reception, auditory association, auditory comprehension, auditory closure, auditory discrimination, and auditory fusion.

Visual processing may include, for example, visual memory, visual sequencing, visual closure, visual discrimination, visual reception, position in space, temporality-spatiality, figure ground, and form constancy.

Haptic processing is defined as taction, which is the sense of touch, kinesthesis, which is awareness of muscle movement, proprioception, which is position in space of own body or its parts or stereognosis, which is the ability to determine shapes from touch. Further development of haptic processing results in establishing concepts of laterality and directionality.

Intersensory integration is the "inner process whereby one type of neurosensory information is converted into another." It may include association, expressive language (oral and written), or shifting from one modality to another.

Concept formation is the ability to process information from previously encountered experiences and, by combining data determined to be appropriate to a different set of circumstances, form a unique concept related to the new situation. It may include the ability to abstract, categorize, or generalize.

(3) Age level expectancy should be interpreted as estimated potential or mental age as determined in intellectual assessment (refer to eligibility criteria #1). A difference of 1 standard deviation or more between a pupil's estimated mental age (which may be represented by a standard score on an intelligence test) and the standard score on achievement tests measuring one or more basic learning skill(s) would be considered a significant discrepancy.

Areas of basic learning skills should include reading comprehension, word recognition, arithmetic, spelling, written language, and language development (receptive and expressive). Although standard scores may not be available in documenting deficits in written expression and language development, clinical observations may be used in lieu of standard scores. In determining a child's level of functioning in basic learning skill(s) the actual level of classroom academic performance must be documented and considered when it varies from the levels determined by individual testing. This is especially important at the primary grades. This criteria may not necessarily apply to children three through five years of age.

(4) The learning style with which a child selects and processes information in the learning situation may be defined as a method or approach uniquely his. To meet LLD criteria, there should be evidence that because of the identified process deficits or other factors (such as inattention, anxiety, distractibility, hyperactivity...) the child learns in a manner so different from most children that in order to make progress in the basic skills, the child must receive Special Education intervention. Written evidence of the child's unique learning style may be obtained and confirmed from referrals, observations, and/or individual testing.

(5) A physician's written report of general medical evaluation should indicate that there are no medical or physical conditions which would be the primary contributing factor affecting the student's achievement or psychological learning processes.

Children with auditory or visual acuity problems may be considered for the program if it is determined by qualified specialists that this is not the primary contributing factor to the learning problem.

In meeting the above criteria, the items discussed under Comprehensive Individual Assessment, TEA Bulletin #711 would be considered, including intelligence factors, educational functioning, and medical and health factors. In addition, the requirement for a comprehensive appraisal of sociological variables (including information regarding cultural life style), must be met and, when appropriate, emotional and/or behavioral factors should be considered.

ADDITIONAL TOPICS CONSIDERED BY THE LLD SUBCOMMITTEE

I. Certain aspects of the Speech and Hearing Therapy category as they relate to screening and placement procedures were examined, resulting in the following recommendations:

(1) The screening process shall have built into it procedures for obtaining speech, language, and hearing data.

(2) A person with certification and training to interpret the gathered data in hearing, and/or speech, and/or language, shall be included on committees considering said information.

(3) In situations where there is a question of placement with an LLD teacher or a Speech Therapist, the decision of which is the most appropriate placement should be a function of the ARD Committee and is dependent on the individual child's needs. Placement with an LLD teacher or Speech Therapist should not preclude placement with both if this is deemed necessary.

II. Refer to Texas Education Agency's Administrative Guide and Special Education Handbook, Bulletin #711, page 9, for guidelines for establishing eligibility in programs for Minimally Brain-Injured Children.

III. TEA requires that children must be comprehensively reappraised at least every three (3) years in order to continue receiving Special Education services. For continued L/LD placement, the same factors must be assessed as outlined in the Specific Eligibility Criteria for initial placement:

1) Intellectual functioning.
2) Identification of process deficits
3) Discrepancy between expectancy and educational performance.
4) Documentation of a deviant learning style.
5) Written report of physical examination

The discrepancy between age level expectancy and current educational performance need not be as large as at the time of initial placement, since the child is expected to make progress with Special Education support.

All other items included under Comprehensive Individual Assessment, Bulletin #711, page 14, must be renewed with a reappraisal. In the case of "sociological variables," family background information should be updated as a part of the continuing communication with parents. When emotional and/or behavioral factors appear to contribute to the learning problems, these should be considered during reappraisal.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

I. Recommendation to TEA

Re: Physical Examination

When placement in an L/LD Program is being considered, it should be a function of the screening committee to determine, in each individual child's case, if a physical examination should be required.

II. In addition to the issues which are addressed in this document, this committee recommends that a subcommittee for Speech, Language, and Hearing services be formed. Clarification of this recommendation will be presented by a member of this committee to the Steering Committee.

III. It is recommended that each district develop specific criteria for dismissal from the L/LD program. It is strongly suggested that before dismissal, each student be given a trial period in the regular classroom during which time the Resource teacher will monitor the child's progress.

APPENDIX VI

Committee Reports

Position Paper

A MODEL APPRAISAL DELIVERY SYSTEM
for
SPECIAL EDUCATION

I. Referral

A. Parents must be notified of "any referrals or screening." (Policy 9, p. 1 & 2)

1. Some authorities insist that notification must take place before referral. This philosophy suggests that the notice of referral would be accomplished by regular school staff. Note: Where regular school staff are utilized for notification purposes, care should be taken to insure·

a. that they do not attempt to explain the special education program, or

b. that they are thoroughly familiar with the special education program

2. Other authorities propose that parents need only be notified of the "referral or screening" and, therefore, special education personnel can be utilized in the notification process.

3. All seem to agree, however, that notification should take place in person either at school or at home and in a time frame very close to the referral or screening act.

B. Referral may be made by the parent or guardian, physician, community agencies, other appropriate individuals, groups, or organizations, school personnel, or as a result of the school's systematic screening procedure. (Bulletin 711 p. 13)

II. Screening - two types of screening are indicated by Bulletin 711 (p. 13).

A. "School's systematic screening prodecure" i.e. hearing and vision screening or other group screening activities for all school children.

1. this type of screening may be performed routinely by regular staff, however;

2. if performed by special education personnel notification of parent must be accomplished for each pupil participating in the screening activity

B. "Screening consists of generating and compiling all immediately available data." (Persons responsible designated by LEA)

1. Analysis of data

   a. Selection of alternatives

      (1) eligible or ineligible for further consideration of special education services,

      (2) placement in diagnostic class,

      (3) referral for comprehensive assessment, specifying if possible, extent of assessment,

      (4) referral for other types or kinds of service,

      (5) referral directly to the Admission, Dismissal and Review Committee, or

      (6) other alternatives

2. May involve parents

3. Notification of parent required if not involved in screening (I,A, 1 and 2)

III. Parent Counseling

   A. Must take place following screening if no previous contact has been made.

   B. Parent should be aware of child's school difficulty before contacted by Special Education personnel.

   C. Counseling should include the following appropriate items:

      1. notification of referral or screening, (Policy 9)

      2. secure written permission for comprehensive individual assessment including psychological testing, study, observations and consideration for placement of student, (Policy 9)

      3. written permission to implement any other screening alternative selected is desirable, but not required i.e., diagnostic placement

      4. written permission for or notice of need of general medical evaluation,

      5. parents opinion of childs language preference in writing,

      6. a release of relevant information from other sources to the school, in writing, (Policy 9) (See General Discussion Area, II, B, this document)

7. counseling related to the parents right to examine and question any information, records or data regarding child and the procedure for appeals and hearings (Series 7100) should the parent desire to challenge content of the child's records or placement

8. collect case study information

9. acknowledgement of notification of above items in writing should be obtained

IV. Comprehensive Individual Assessment

A. Performed by appropriately certified and/or licensed professional

B. Type of test or test used:

1. should be of global design, standardized, and sophisticated,

2. should be culture free,

3. should be administered in language best spoken and understood by pupil (examinee) (primary, native or best suited language) (Policy 9)

C. Majority of assessment should be performed individually

D. All family and student rights pertaining to confidentiality of assessment must be protected (See: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 and Texas Open Records Law)

E. Parent must be counseled in regard to the results of the Individual Comprehensive Assessment. (2ND PARENT CONTACT)

V. Admission, Review and Dismissal Committee

A. May include parent (if so, replaces 2nd parent contact)

B. Includes representatives from: (Bulletin 711)

1. AdminiSTRATION

2. instruction

3. appraisal and/or special education

C. Actions included:

1. determines eligibility

2. approve placement

3. initiate development of educational plan

        4. conducts annual review

        5. provide signed written summary of deliberations

VI. Second Parent Contact

- A. Explain test results
- B. Make sure parents agree to placement and secure permission in writing if not previously secured. (Legal Position)
- C. May be held in conjunction with ARD committee meeting
- D. Communications accomplished in person and in appropriate language (Policy 9)

VII. Placement - the act of bringing pupil into contact with the person or persons who will be instructing, counseling, training or other wise remediating the pupils identified deficits and/or who will be providing special avenues of learning.

- A. Placement made only by ARD Committee (Bulletin 711)
- B. Parent consent in writing (Legal Position)
- C. Appropriate instructional arrangement
    - 1. instructor is properly certified and/or expertise sufficiently documented
    - 2. contact hours recommended by Educational Plan
- D. Pupil meets eligibility criteria

VIII. Ninety Day Review

- A. Informal review held by special education teacher and supportive staff
- B. Should also include regular teacher if involved
- C. Documentation necessary

IX. Annual Review

- A. Conducted by ARD Committee
- B. Documentation necessary

X. Re-evaluation

- A. Every three (3) years or sooner if necessary
- B. Each re-evaluation to be handled as though it were a new referral except:

1. formal referral not necessary

2. screening not necessary

C. Includes all basic eligibility standards

General Discussion Areas

I. Procedure for hearings and appeals (TEA Series 7100)

A. All aggrieved parties shall be entitled to hearing and appeals regarding controversies in which they are legitimately involved.

B. A written procedure for orderly hearings and appeals of aggrieved parties shall be adopted by the local governing board.

C. Suggested Procedure: (For aggrieved parent, guardian or student eighteen (18) years of age or older)

1. Aggrieved Party-School Conference - Aggrieved party should first contact the involved campus principal, special education teacher, or appropriate special education supportive staff member.

a. Campus principal must be advised of the grievance and he will arrange for a conference to be held.

b. Special education director must be notified of grievance.

c. It is anticipated that many trival type grievances will be resolved at this level.

d. All involved parties have the right to request the presence of other individuals with information relevant to the situation or with decision making authority regarding the ruling, action or failure to act complained of.

e. Although this is a preliminary attempt to resolve problems in a more or less informal manner, some simple written documentation of the conference and the decisions rendered should be kept.

2. ARD Committee hearing

a. If a grievance is not resolved at the Aggrieved Party-School Conference then the ARD Committee shall be convened.

b. All interested parties shall have the right to convene the ARD Committee for an official hearing.

(1) **The aggrieved party shall file a request in writing with the campus principal or the special education director for a hearing by the ARD Committee, which shall identify the ruling, action, or failure to act complained of; such request shall be filed within fifteen (15) days of the date on which notice of such action or ruling is communicated to the person requesting the hearing. (special education director must be informed)**

(2) **The officer receiving the request shall set a time and place for the ARD Committee hearing, such time shall not be less than fifteen (15) nor more than thirty (30) days from the date on which such request is filed and shall give notice of the time and place of the hearing in writing to all interested parties.**

(3) **All procedural requirements of TEA Series 7102.3 shall apply. (Hearings and Appeals)**

D. Route of Appeal

1. From a Aggrieved Party-School Conference to the ARD Committee

2. From the ARD Committee to the Superintendent of schools

3. Additional appeals shall follow the route prescribed by the Texas Education Code, Hearings and Appeals, 7103.2

E. The Superintendent of Schools shall organize for hearing and appeal above the ARD Committee level.

II. Release of information (confidential and other)

A. From other sources to the school (FERPA 1974) requires parent written permission usually obtained from first Special Education Parent Conference.

B. School to school (FERPA 1974)

1. Parent advised of release

2. Parent provided a copy of released information, if desired

3. Parent must be provided knowledge of their opportunity to challenge the content of the records to be released; however, if the parents have already moved to the receiving school district the receiving school district should provide (for the sending school district) a written parent release indicating that they do not desire a copy of the items released nor do they intend to challenge the content of the record prior to this transmital.

C. From School to other agencies, organizations, individuals, etc.

1. Parent consent in writing

2. Specific records to be released, the reason for such release, and to whom.

3. Copy of records released to parent, if desired

III. Language

A. Pupils best language

1. Establish primary home language (documented) Policy 9

2. Establish best spoken language (documented)

3. Establish best understood language (documented)

B. Test performed in pupils best language or languages

C. Communication with parent performed in appropriate language

RECOMMENDED APPRAISAL PROCESS

1. When a student is perceived as having an achievement or adjustment problem, regular program personnel contact the parent to discuss the problem and what is being done to alleviate it. Student data available at the school is reviewed during this process.

2. When the regular program cannot be adjusted to meet the student's needs, the regular teacher will initiate a conference with the principal and other school personnel to discuss whether or not the student should be referred to Special Education.

3. If the decision is made to refer to Special Education, a Referral Form (Form 1) is completed by the regular teacher or other designated person and a parent conference is held to obtain permission for screening evaluation and consideration for placement (Form 2). Parents are informed of the need for the student to get physical examination. In addition, the following forms are completed or initiated:

   Dominant Language Determination (Form 3)
   Social and Development History (Form 4)
   Consent to Release and/or Transfer Records (Form 5)
   Checklist of Progress (Form 6)
   Report of Parent Contact (Form 7)

4. All available data will be reviewed by the campus Screening Committee. This data will include:

   Hearing and Vision Report (Form 8)
   Teacher Observation Checklist (Form 9a or 9b)
   Academic Performance and Attendance (Form 10)

   All alternatives will be considered as stipulated by Bulletin 711. Results of the Screening Committee meeting will be documented (Form 11). Parents will be informed of these results and a notation indicated on Form 11.

5. Comprehensive individual assessment will be accomplished (Form 12a or 12b) and a physical examination obtained (Form 13). Assessment will be made by a certified person and the student will be tested in his or her dominant language/languages.

6. Results of the individual assessment and physical examination will be forwarded to the Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee to determine eligibility, placement, and to initiate the Educational Plan (Forms 14 and 15). If the student does not meet Special Education eligibility criteria the collected data should be provided regular program personnel.

7. If the ARD Committee recommends placement, a parent conference will be held and permission for placement obtained (Form 16). Appeal procedures and parent's right to examine the student's records will be explained. A supportive staff member will interpret test results to the parent. If the parent disagrees with recommended placement, the parent will be referred to the principal. The student will not be placed. Form 7 may be used to document parent disapproval.

8. The Educational Plan is completed and distributed and the student is placed.

9. A periodic Review of the Educational Plan is made at least every three months by the instructional staff (Form 17).

10. The ARD Committee will conduct an annual review of each student's program to determine continuation, change, reappraisal, or termination (Form 14).

11. Reevaluations will be performed at least every three years or earlier if necessary (Form 18). Parent permission is obtained for the re-evaluation (Form 2).

12. Transfer of records.

When a student transfers between districts/clusters, a request will be made by the gaining district Special Education department to the losing district Special Education department. Parent's permission will be obtained for the release of records (Form 5).

FORMS

NUMBER	TITLE
1.	Referral Form
2.	Parent Permission for Screening/Evaluation
3.	Dominant Language Determination
4.	Social Developmental History
5.	Consent to Release or Transfer Information
6.	Checklist of Progress
7.	Record of Parent Contact
8.	Hearing and Vision Report
9.	a. Teacher Observation Checklist (Primary)
9.	b. Teacher Observation Checklist (Elementary/Secondary)
10.	Academic Performance and Attendance
11.	Screening Committee Report
12.	a. Comprehensive Individual Assessment
12.	b. Appraisal Report/Appraisal Analysis
13.	a. Physicians Report and Cover letter (2 pages)
13.	b. Family's Health Report (2 pages)
14.	ARD Committee Report/Student Transportation
15.	Educational Plan
16.	Application for Placement and Transportation
17.	Individual Educational Plan Review
18.	Request for Reevaluation

SPECIAL EDUCATION
APPRAISAL DELIVERY SYSTEM MODEL

Parent Awareness	Parent awareness of student's achievement/adjustment problem Parent informed by regular teacher
Regular Teacher	Exhausts all regular program resources
Regular Teacher/ Administrator Conf.	Decision to make Special Education Referral
Regular Teacher/ and/or Sp. Ed. Rep. Parent Conf.	Parent permission to screen and evaluate (adult student signature) Social/developmental history Dominant language determined Parent informed of need for medical Special Education representative included Permission to release records
Screening Meeting	Medical required prior to ARD meeting Review all available data Select appropriate alternative Teacher observation and academic performance Vision and hearing (speech if necessary) Parent informed of results
Comprehensive Ind. Assessment	By certified/licensed professional Testing in appropriate language/languages Instruments determined by examiner and student needs
ARD Meeting	Recommends placement or other alternative Initiates Educational Plan Parent involvement at meeting optional
Parent Conference	Explain test results and recommended placement Parent permission to place and student transportation (if necessary) Parent appeal procedure and right to examine student file is explained If parent disagrees, refer to principal
Educational Plan	Instructional arrangement and contact time Prepared by appraisal personnel and teachers
Placement	
Three-Month-Review	By S.E. teacher and supportive staff
Annual Review	By ARD Committee
Re-Evaluation	Every three years or sooner if necessary Parent permission obtained

SAMPLE FORM

Referral Form for Diagnostic Evaluation

Student's Name ______________________________ Birthdate ______________

School ________________________ Grade ________ Teacher ______________

Parent's Name ______________________ Address ______________________

Phone ________________________________ ______________________________
(home) (business) (city) (zip)

Referred by ______________________ Date of Referral ______________

Date of parent conference to inform of student's problem ____________________

Is child's problem primarily academic or adjustment? (circle one)

Description of problem:

Are there any difficulties of speech and/or language? ____________________

Have any remedial measures been taken prior to referral? ______________ Indicate:

_____ Failing notices	_____ Different materials
_____ Note to parents	_____ Different methods
_____ Additional help (regular resource or other)	_____ Consulted Principal
_____ Peer tutoring	_____ Consulted Supportive Personnel

Teachers estimate of present grade equivalents:

Other Comments:

______________________ ________
Teacher Date

______________________ ________
Principal Date

SAMPLE FORM

Parent's Permission for Screening Evaluation

____
Name of School

I request that ____________________________, __________________, __________
Name of Student Relationship D.O.B.

be evaluated by personnel of the ____________________________ District. Such evaluations may include academic, psychological, and medical diagnostic interpretations.

The information gained from the study will be used to assist the school personnel to meet my child's needs more adequately. Information generated by the appraisal will not be released to persons or agencies outside the district without my written permission.

If I am not able to accompany my child to the evaluation facility, permission is granted for district personnel to provide transportation. I hereby agree that in the event of any accident the district personnel will not be held responsible.

School Personnel Evaluation	Learning Center Evaluation
____________________________	____________________________
Parent or Guardian Date	Parent or Guardian Date

- -

SAMPLE FORM

DOMINANT LANGUAGE DETERMINATION

	English Ingles	Spanish Espanol
1. What is the primary language of the home? - - - - - - - - - - - ¿Qué acostumbran hablar en su casa? - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	☐	☐
2. Is your son/daughter most fluent in - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ¿Sue hijos hablan Y entienden major - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	☐	☐
3. What language does your son/daughter have the best speaking ability? ¿Qué se le facilita más a sus hijos para hablar? - - - - - - - -	☐	☐
4. What language does your son/daughter understand best? - - - - - - ¿Qué se les hace mas fácil entender a sue hijos? - - - - - - - -	☐	☐
	Yes	No
5. Do you believe your son/daughter speaks and understands English and Spanish equally well? - ¿Cree Ud. que su hijo/hija hablan Y entienden tan bién el Inglés como el Español?- -	☐	☐

Father or Mother Signature - Firma del Papa O la Mama

Date - Fecha

SAMPLE FORM

Social & Developmental History

Date _______________

Student's Name _______________ Date of Birth _______________ Age _____

Parent's Name _______________ Rank _____ Social Security # _______________

Address _______________ Phone _______________
(home) (business)

Informant _______________ Completed by: _______________
Position: _______________

FAMILY INFORMATION

Name	Relationship	Age	Occupation	Education	Birthplace	Living at home

EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

At what age did your child enter school? _____ Number of schools attended _______________

Last two schools attended:

School	City & State	Grade Level

Has a grade been repeated? _____ Yes _____ No If yes, what grade? _______________

Subjects your child likes _______________ dislikes _______________

Has any remedial work been done in academic subjects? _____ Yes _____ No

If so, what? _______________ For how long? _______________

Have any tests or evaluations been done _____ Yes _____ No. If so, when? _______________

Where? _______________

Have any other members of the family had any problems in school? _______________

Please describe _______________

GENERAL INFORMATION

When does child go to bed at night? _______ Does he/she have to be coaxed? _____ Yes _____ No

Special abilities and interests ____

Does your child enjoy school? _____ Yes _____ No Comment: ___________________________

GENERAL BEHAVIOR

Check all of the following which describe your child:

_____Friendly
_____Unresponsive
_____Temper outbursts
_____Bites nails

_____Happy
_____Sullen
_____Aggressive
_____Quiet

_____Explosive
_____Stubborn
_____Inferiority Complex

Statements which describe your child are: (please check appropriate description)

1. Dependability:
_____Usually completes assigned task
_____Must be encouraged to complete assigned task
_____Rarely completes task even if encouraged

2. Effort:
_____Above average in effort
_____Average in effort
_____Below average
_____Effort blocked by anxiety
_____

3. Attention to Instructions:
_____Listens carefully, carries out instructions
_____Impulsive - starts work before instructions are completed
_____Often asks for instructions to be repeated
_____Listens, but does nothing

4. Peer Relationships:
_____Well-liked by most -- many friends
_____One of the crowd -- neither outstanding number of friends or enemies
_____Loner
_____Disliked by most students

5. Cooperation: _____Always _____Sometimes _____Rarely _____Never

PARENTS' OPINION OF THEIR CHILD'S DIFFICULTY: In general, what is your opinion of your child's difficulty in school?

____

____

____

____

SAMPLE FORM

CONSENT FOR RELEASE OR TRANSFER OF INFORMATION

I hereby consent to the release of the following reports/records on my

son/daughter, ______________________________ Birthdate ____________
Student's full name

- ☐ Past and present academic records
- ☐ Medical
- ☐ Neurological
- ☐ Psychological
- ☐ Educational Plan
- ☐ Parent Permission
- ☐ School and health records containing immunization records
- ☐ Audiological and Speech Evaluation
- ☐ Vision Evaluation
- ☐ Dominant Language Statement
- ☐ Other ____________________
- ☐ ____________________
- ☐ ____________________

____
Signature of Parent or Guardian

____
Date

____
Witness to Signature

THIS REQUEST TO BE SENT TO:	PLEASE RETURN THIS INFORMATION TO:
Name	Name
School/Agency	School/Agency
Address	Address
City	City
Zip Code Telephone	Zip Code Telephone

SE-5

SAMPLE FORM

Student's Name ____________________ Date of Birth ____________________

Grade ____________________ Age September 1st ________

Campus ____________________

(Dates of)

________ Screening Permission
________ Letter to determine primary language (minority language)
________ Developmental History
________ Teacher Referral, checklist/work sample
________ Vision & Hearing screening
________ Observation-Principal, Diagnostician, D-teacher
________ Screening Committee Recommendations
________ Parent Permission for Appraisal
________ Test Report
________ Program recommendations
________ Type of Educational Arrangement
________ Educational Plan Initial
________ Parent Conference, Director/Diagnostician
________ Parent Application for Program
________ Parent permission for medical (if done in District)
________ Medical (written report)
________ A R D Committee Report
________ Modified Ed. Plan ________ ________
________ Modified Ed. Plan ________ ________
________ Annual Review ________ ________

LLD

____1. 2 SD below to 2 above M
____2. Deficit in Basic Process
  ___ Auditory
  ___ Visual
  ___ Haptic
  ___ Intersensory Integration
  ___ Concept formation
____3. Discrepancy between age level expectancy and Performance
____4. Learning Style Markedly deviate from the norm

OTHER

____
____
____
____

MBI

____1. 2 SD below to 2 above M
____2. Strengths & Weaknesses
____3. Methods and Strategies to maximize learning

EMR

____1. Between 2 & 3 SD below M
____2. Strengths & Weaknesses
____3. Methods & Strategies

TMR

____1. More than 3 SD below M
____2. Strengths & Weaknesses
____3. Methods & Strategies

SAMPLE FORM

RECORD OF PARENT CONTACT

Student's Name ____________ Date of Birth ____________ Grade ____________

Location: ____________

Participants: ____________

Summation: ____________

Signed: ____________ Name

____________ Position

SE-7

SAMPLE FORM

Hearing & Vision Report

__________________________ Grade ______ School ______________
Student's Name

__________________________ Date of Request: ___________
Person Requesting Testing

Is the student enrolled in any resource program? ___ Yes ___ No If yes, which one? ___________

__________________________ Testing Requested: Hearing ______ Vision ______

Hearing

Sweep-Check ______________
Date

Pure Tone ______________
Date

Right ear:	500	1000	2000	4000	6000
Left ear:	500	1000	2000	4000	6000

Referred to Out-of-District Specialist: ________
Date

Comments: ______________________

Vision

	Passed (date)	Re-Test (date)
Right Eye:		
Left Eye:		

Glasses worn: Yes _____ No _____

Referred to Out-of-District Specialist: ______
Date

Comments: ______________________

______________________ Signature of Examiner

______________________ Position

______________________ Date person making request informed of results.

S A M P L E   F O R M

TEACHER OBSERVATION CHECKLIST (Primary)

Name________________________ BIRTHDATE____________________ SCHOOL________________

	ADEQUATE	-	INADEQUATE
1. General Skills:			
Cuts with scissors	________		________
Physical Coordination	________		________
Knows Alphabet	________		________
Knows Color Names	________		________
2. Work Habits:			
Attention span	________		________
Completes tasks	________		________
Self Control	________		________
3. Reading:			
Recognizes letters	________		________
Recognizes words	________		________
Imagination	________		________
4. Writing:			
Writes name	________		________
Writes words	________		________
Writes sentences	________		________
Writes numerals 1 to 10	________		________
5. Listening:			
Recognizes initial sounds	________		________
Understands oral directions	________		________
Comprehends stories	________		________
6. Arithmetic:			
Counts 1 - 10	________		________
Counts 1 - 20	________		________
Counts 1 - 100	________		________
7. Socilization:			
Plays cooperatively	________		________
Respects authority	________		________
Participates in group activities	________		________
Meets frustrations	________		________
Accepts corrections	________		________
Accepts responsibility for own action	________		________
Self identification (awareness of body parts and self concepts)	________		________
Talks with others	________		________

COMMENTS:

Teacher______________________________ Date______________________________

SAMPLE FORM

TEACHER OBSERVATION CHECKLIST (Elementary/Secondary)

Name______________________ Birthdate______________ School___________

Please indicate by putting one check (✓) in front of the items which the child exhibits only occasionally and a double check (✓✓) for those that he exhibits very frequently.

A. VISUAL:

______1. Holds book too close and avoids work requiring close eye work.
______2. Moves head forward or tilted to one side when engaged in visual tasks.
______3. Rubs eyes often when engaged in visual tasks.
______4. Cannot discriminate between letters and numbers.
______5. Rotates or reverses letters and numbers.
______6. Calls words incorrectly based on too few cues.
______7. Sequences numbers or letters wrong or copies incorrectly.
______8. Can label objects but can not describe them or what is happening in pictures.
______9. Can not comprehend what he reads.
______10. Can not solve state problems.

B. AUDITORY:

______1. Does not appear to attend.
______2. Omits sound units or letters in spelling words.
______3. Mispronounces words, can't blend sounds or has poor phonic skills.
______4. Misperceives or misunderstands what is said to him.
______5. Makes grammatical or syntactical errors.
______6. Short attention span.
______7. Can not do more than one instruction at a time.
______8. Can not understand oral directions (often asks to have them repeated).
______9. Does not seem to comprehend spoken words (may recognize the word).
______10. Unable to tell stories or related experiences.
______11. Can not learn number concepts or number facts.

C. PERCEPTUAL-MOTOR:

______1. Difficulty in fine motor skills (cutting, pasting, drawing).
______2. Improper pencil grasp (clutched in fist, held too lightly or presses so hard to break lead and tear paper).
______3. Poor handwriting compared with peers' writing.
______4. Difficulty in copying from board or from material on desk.
______5. Poorly coordinated; clumsy (unable to move around in classroom, or on playground).
______6. Highly confused; unable to distinguish directions such as right-left; up-down
______7. Often begins tasks with one hand and finishes with another.
______8. Lacks grasp of the meaning of time; always late or confused.
______9. Unable to identify and recognize like and unlike forms and/or objects.

D. BEHAVIOR:

______1. Underactive (seems listless, couldn't care less) in classroom or on playground.
______2. Overactive (can't sit still in class).
______3. Is slow to finish work (doesn't apply self, daydreams a lot, falls asleep).
______4. Unusually short attention span for daily school work.
______5. Easily distracted from school work (can't concentrate with the slightest disturbance in the classroom, or is highly disorganized).
______6. Inconsistency in quality of performance from day to day.
______7. Repeats the same behavior over and over.
______8. Doesn't get along with most peers (can't make or keep friends, is picked on, wants to change rules, poor loser, or is aggressive).
______9. Unusually shy or withdrawn.
______10. Tense or disturbed (bites lip, twists hair, high strung).
______11. Cries easily or may explode for no apparent reason.
______12. Demands unusual amount of attention during regular classroom activities.

(over)

SE-9b

TEACHER'S COMMENTS: (Description of student's achievement and/or adjustment problem)

TEACHER'S NAME______________________________ DATE____________________

SUBJECT___________________________________ PERIOD___________________

SAMPLE FORM

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND ATTENDANCE

Name of Child ______________________________ Sex __________ Age __________

Date of Birth ______________ Grade ______ School ______________________________

PROVIDE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IF COPY OF PERMANENT RECORD IS NOT ATTACHED:

SCHOOL HISTORY

A. Schools and Years Attended

School Year(s)	Name of School	Grade	Promoted-Retained

B. School Attendance

Indicate grades repeated ____________.Does child have a pattern of absenteeism? _____

If so, give reasons or explain ____

____

List years when student's absences exceeded 10 days ___________________________

TEST RESULTS

A. Intelligence Tests (group or individual)

Date Given	Name of Test	Verbal I.Q.	Non-Verbal I.Q.	Total I.Q.

B. Other Tests (Achievement, Aptitudes, etc.) Report Grade Equivalents for subtest given in Reading, Language, Arithmetic. Write in subtest areas, e.g., "comprehension" under Reading.

Date Given	Name of Test	Reading	Language	Arithmetic

Academic Performance and Attendance - cont'd.

C. Teacher Grade (Record in Chronological Order)

School Year	Grade Level	Quarter	Indicate Subject and Grade for Each Quarter			
		1st				
		2nd				
		3rd				
		1st				
		2nd				
		3rd				
		1st				
		2nd				
		3rd				
		1st				
		2nd				
		3rd				
		1st				
		2nd				
		3rd				
		1st				
		2nd				
		3rd				

C. Report other professional evaluations (Psychological, Psychiatric, Neurological, Speech and Hearing, etc.)

Date Given	Type of Evaluation	Agency Address	Examiner	Report Available?

SAMPLE FORM

SCREENING COMMITTEE REPORT

Date ____________________

Student's Name ____________________ Date of Birth ____________ Age ____

Parent's Name ____________________ Rank ____ Home Phone ____________ Duty Phone ____________

School ____________________ Grade ____ Teacher ____________________

Reason for Referral. ____________________

Discussion: ____________________

Actions to be taken: ____________________

Parents notified: ____________ ____________________
Date by whom - Signature

Committee Members Attending:

Name	Position
Name	Position
Name	Position
Name	Position

SE-11

SAMPLE FORM

COMPREHENSIVE INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT

NAME:
DOB:
AGE:
SEX:
GRADE:
DOT:__________ Initial____ Reeval_______

I. Reason for Referral

II. Background History

III. Test Behavior

IV. Tests Administered

V. Test Results

VI. Learning Style

VII. Discussion

VIII. Conclusions

IX. Recommendations

SAMPLE FORM

APPRAISAL REPORT

Student:
Sex:
Date of Birth:
Date of Testing:
Chronological Age:

School:
Grade:
Teacher:
Examiner:
Vision:
Hearing:

RESULTS OF TESTING:

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children ____________,
Information ______
Comprehension ______
Arithmetic ______
Similarities ______
Digit Span ______

Pict. Completion ______
Pict. Arrangement ______
Object Assembly ______
Block Design ______
Coding ______
Mazes ______

Verbal ______ Performance ______ Full Scale ______

Cohen Factor
Spatial ______
Concept ______
Sequence ______
Percep. Organ. ______
Verbal Compr. ______
Anxiety ______

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities
Auditory Recep. ______
Visual Recep. ______
Visual Seq. Mem. ______
Auditory Assoc. ______
Auditory Seq. Mem. ______

Visual Associat. ______
Verbal Expres. ______
Visual Closure ______
Gram. Closure ______
Manual Expr. ______

PLA ______ MA ______

Wide Range Achievement Test
Reading ______
Spelling ______
Arithmetic ______

Peabody Individual Achievement Test
Mathematics ______ ______
Read Recog. ______ ______
Read Compr. ______ ______
Spelling ______ ______
Gen. Inf. ______ ______

Bender Gestalt
______ Rotations
______ Distortions
______ Collisions
______ Perseveration
______ M A
____
____

Draw-A-Person
____
____
____
____
____
____
____

Wepman Auditory Discrimination ____________________
Memory For Design ____________________
Peabody Picture Vocabulary ____________________
Full Range Picture Vocabulary ____________________
Leiter ____________________
Key Math ____________________

Observations:
____
____
____
____

____
Diagnostician

SE-12b

White - Central Office Pink - Teacher Yellow - Mail

SAMPLE FORM

APPRAISAL INFORMATION ANALYSIS

Identified Strengths:
Auditory Memory Sequence Integration Reception Motor ________
Visual Memory Sequence Integration Reception Motor ________
Haptic ________________________________
Educational Performance ____________________
Motor ________________________________
____

Identified Weaknesses:
Auditory Memory Sequence Integration Reception Motor ________
Visual Memory Sequence Integration Reception Motor ________
Haptic ________________________________
Educational Performance ____________________
Motor ________________________________
____

Preferred Learning Style:

Visual	Multisensory
Auditory	Reinforcement, Avg. Above Avg.
Abstract	Isolated
Concrete	Small Group
Experience	Large Group

____

Behavioral/Emotional Factors:

Relative Educational Performance
Reading ________________
Arithmetic ________________
Language ________________
____

Recommendations:

____ 1. Recommend placement in ______________ class.
____ 2. Conduct additional evaluation ________________________.
____ 3. Speech Therapy ________________.
____ 4. Comprehensive examination for hearing-vision.
____ 5. Counseling services ________________________.
____ 6. Consultative assistance with parents ________________.
____ 7. Extended conferences with ________________________.
____ 8. ____.
____ 9. ____.

White - Central Office Pink - Teacher Yellow - Mail

SAMPLE FORM

REFERRAL FOR PHYSICAL EXAMINATION

____
Date

TO THE EXAMINING PHYSICIAN:

____________________________, a pupil enrolled in __________________ School, is being evaluated to determine eligibility for special educational services. Educational and/or psychological appraisal has revealed the possibility of

____

____

Eligibility requirements for this handicapping category, as set by the Texas Education Agency, include:

Please complete the attached physicians report form and return to the person listed below. Any information not requested in this form which would be pertinent to the child's placement or educational management would be appreciated. All information will be held in the strictest confidence and will be available only to professional personnel directly concerned with this pupil. Your assistance in evaluating this student is appreciated.

____
Signature

____
Title

This referral should go directly from the school to the doctor.

Physician's report should be sent directly to:

____

____

____

SE-Cover Letter

PHYSICIAN'S REPORT

Name________________________________ Age______ No:__________

School________________________________ Teacher______________

III. Physical Examination

Height		Weight:	Pulse:	Respiration:	B/P
Vision R	L	Glasses: Yes No	Hearing: R	L	Urine Test

Build: (Circle one) Obese Medium Slender

Indicate ( ) if normal or abnormal. If abnormal state details under findings.

	Norm.	Abnorm.		Norm.	Abnorm.		Norm.	Abnorm.
Gen. Appearance			Throat & Tonsils			Hernia		
Ears			Lymph glands			Genitalia		
Eyes			Breasts			Spine		
Skin			Chest			Joints		
Nose			Lungs			Extremities		
Teeth & gums			Heart			Neurological, gen.		
Tongue			Abdomen					

Findings: Details of abnormal and/or significant findings.

Additional Medical Services Needed

Symptoms to be reported

Limitations to be observed

I have examined this child and found him/her to be free from infectious and contagious disease and capable of doing the physical tasks required of students in accordance with the above limitations.

Physician's Signature ______________________ Date ______________________

Typed or Printed ______________________ MAIL TO:

SE-13a

SAMPLE FORM

FAMILY'S HEALTH REPORT

Please complete the blanks below as they apply to your child. A physician's report is required by the Texas Education Agency. The purpose of this report is to make certain that the student's doctor has examined the student and ruled out routine physical problems as a cause of school difficulties.

STUDENT: ____

Last First Middle

I. Family History:

Has anyone in your family (parents, brothers, or sisters) ever had any of the following?

Diabetes ______________________ Tuberculosis ______________ Which Member? __________

Is anyone in the family currently ill? **Please explain:** ______________________________

____

II. Personal History:

Has your child had any of the following? Please explain:

Serious illnesses ______________________________

Hospitalizations ______________________________

Operations ______________________________

____

Is your child currently on any medications? Please list:

____

Check (✓) the appropriate column concerning your child's health condition and childhood illnesses he may have contracted.

	YES	NO
Allergies		
Asthma		
Chest pains		
Colds (frequent or severe)		
Convulsions or seizures		
Ear trouble		
Frequent sore throats		
Headaches (frequent)		
Heart trouble		
Joint pains		
Reaction to drugs		
Skin rashes or eczema		

	YES	NO
Stomach disorder or abdominal pain		
Tumor or growth		
Urinary infection		
Vision problem		
Chickenpox		
Diphtheria		
Measles		
Mumps		
Pneumonia		
Rheumatic Fever		
Other __________		

Please explain any yes answers: ______________________________

____

____

SE-13b

SAMPLE FORM

ADMISSION, REVIEW AND DISMISSAL COMMITTEE REPORT

(Circle one)

Initial ____________

Annual ____________

School ____________ Teacher ____________

Student's Name ____________ Date of birth ____________ Age ____________

Purpose of Meeting: ARD Date ____________ Primary Handicap ____________

Specific recommendations include: Other Handicaps ____________

Regular classroom involvement ____________ (grade) For ____________ (school year)

Type of Placement ____________ (suggested amount of time per day)

Noted strengths include: ____________

Deficit areas for remediation include: ____________

Other comments and/or recommendations: ____________

Within 12 weeks, ____________ (Teacher's Name) is responsible for reviewing this programming and/or educational plan and reporting the findings to the Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman will report to the Committee any changes which would merit further study and/or action for Committee review.

Chairman & Adm. Signature	Teacher Signature	Appraisal Signature
Other (Specify)	Other (Specify)	Other (Specify)

THIS STUDENT (IS, IS NOT) ELIGIBLE AND (NEEDS, DOES NOT NEED) TRANSPORTATION.

Address: ____________ Phone: ____________ Bus ____________ Route No. ____________

SE-14

SAMPLE FORM

EDUCATIONAL PLAN ________ Original ________ Revision

Name ______________________________ School ________________ Student Resources: ____ Resource

____ Adaptive Resource

D.O.B. ____________________________ Grade ________________ ____ Helping Teacher

____ Speech Therapy

Date ______________________________ Revision required by (date): __________ ____ Other __________

Evaluation	
Materials/Media	
Instructional Strategies	
Objective	
Identified Need	

SAMPLE FORM

APPLICATION FOR PLACEMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

Date ____________________

Student's Name ______________________________ Date of Birth ______________ Age ________

Parent's Name ________________________ Rank ________ Home Phone ____________ Duty Phone ________

School ____________________________ Grade ________ Teacher ______________________________

The results of the appraisal of the educational needs of our child have been interpreted, and we are in agreement with the recommendations of the ARD Committee. Application, therefore, is made for the instructional arrangement recommended by the Committee. It has been explained to us that students receive educational assistance through various instructional arrangements on a trial basis to determine the appropriateness of the placement, and that evaluation of the progress of each student will be an ongoing process throughout the year. I grant permission for my child to be transported, if necessary, to receive instructional services. After careful review of test results, teacher comments, and the ARD recommendations, I request that my child be placed in the ______________________ program. Access to my child's records and appeal procedures have been explained to me.

______________________________ ______________________________
Parent or Guardian Date

______________________________ ______________________________
School Representative Date

SAMPLE FORM

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN REVIEW

Student's Name ______________________________ Date of Birth ______________

School ______________________________ Teacher's Name ______________

1. Date ______________________

Summary of Progress: ____

____

Future Recommendation: ____

____

Chairman & Administrative Signature	Instructional Signature	Other (Specify)

2. Date ______________________

Summary of Progress: ____

____

Future Recommendation: ____

____

Chairman & Administrative Signature	Instructional Signature	Other (Specify)

3. Date ______________________

Summary of Progress ____

____

Recommendations for future placement ____

____

Chairman & Administrative Signature	Instructional Signature	Other (Specify)

SAMPLE FORM

REQUEST FOR RE-EVALUATION

Name of Pupil________________ Code Number Type of Program________________ Date________

Birthdate________________ Age__________ School________________

Date of entry into class (this year)________________ Teacher________________

Date of ARD into class (this year)________________ Current Medical________________ Date

PRESENT TEST SCORES IN PERMANENT FOLDER

Date	Test	Results	Date	Test	Results

AREAS OF EDUCATIONAL STRENGTH:

MOST EFFECTIVE METHOD(S) OF LEARNING

______Auditory
______Visual
______Motor
______Kinesthetic
______Visual-motor
______Auditory-motor
______Auditory-visual
______Tactile

BEST LEARNING ENVIRONMENT(S)

______Group
______Large
______Small
______Individual
______Carrel
______Seat Work
______Position in Room
______Board Work

Describe the ability of the pupil to function in present classroom (include description of program expectancies, academic standards, and recommendations for future placement).

Describe present behavior and social functioning (include pupil's reaction to success and failure, changes in social history, etc.):

Comments/Prognosis - Has child reached the objectives of the Educational Plan?

Attach additional pertinent information or use reverse side of page.

APPROVED BY: Date________________

____
Signature of Approving Principal

____
Director Special Services

____
Signature of

NON-ENGLISH COMMITTEE REPORT

The basis for Special Education is found in the belief that every child is entitled to full recognition of his right to educational opportunity consistent with his ability to learn. Part of the general eligibility criteria for all students being considered for placement in Special Education includes the following directives:

(1) School districts shall not assign national origin-minority group pupils (or linguistically different pupils) to special education classes on the basis of criteria which were developed solely upon the command of the English language.

(2) Pupils may not be placed in special education services if the only deficiencies identified are directly attributable to a different cultural life style, or not having had educational opportunities, or not having achieved from previous educational experiences.

(Policy Memo #2, Dec. 1973 - Implementation
of Section 21.911 of Texas Education Code)

In addition, any pupil considered for or provided special education services shall be tested or otherwise appraised in the pupil's primary home language, the pupil's most fluent language, the language in which the pupil has the best speaking ability, and the language the pupil has the best capacity for understanding.

Recommended Instruments for Identification of Children of Limited English-speaking Ability:

The following tests purport to measure oral language proficiency. Only the OLE is suitable for a level higher than the early elementary grades. The tests are concerned only with oral language skills. As children progress in school and develop skills in reading and writing, standardized instruments which measure performance in all four language skills should be used to determine whether the children perform at grade level or are limited in English language ability.

- Bilingual Syntax Measure
- PAL (Primary Acquisition of Language) Oral Language Dominance Measure
- OLE (Oral Language Evaluation)
- SWCEL (Southwestern Cooperative Education Laboratory Test)
- Pictorial Test of Bilingualism and Language Dominance

In order to meet the most recent state and federal guidelines, the following revision of Bulletin 711, Administrative Guide and Handbook for Special Education, (page 14) is suggested:

Comprehensive Individual Assessment

Comprehensive individual assessment is the observation, diagnosing, and identification of individual pupil achievement and/or adjustment characteristics. It provides all necessary information for developing the educational plan, determining eligibility for special education services, and information for planning appropriate instructional arrangements.

Comprehensive individual assessment includes the following factors when appropriate:

language factors

Comprehensive appraisal of language consists of individually administered test(s) of language dominance and proficiency--both expressive and receptive.

intellectual functioning

Comprehensive appraisal of intelligence consists of individually administered test(s) of mental ability designed to assess a wide range of intelligence factors from verbal scales/items, performance scales/items, and adaptive behavior scales/items. Adaptive behavior is the effectiveness or degree with which the individual meets the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of her or his age and cultural group. Verbal scales/items shall be administered in the pupil's demonstrated dominant language.

Data to determine intellectual functioning is not gathered from single-area reference test(s) such as vocabulary, strictly verbal tests, or strictly perceptual-motor tests. Such instruments may be used as a part of or in addition to a comprehensive battery to assess a wide range of intelligence factors, but they may not be used to determine total intellectual functioning for the decision-making process.

Assessment instruments used to assess verbal, performance, and adaptive behaviors related to the measurement of intellectual functioning must be selected from a list provided by the Commissioner of Education as approved by the State Board of Education.

educational functioning

Comprehensive appraisal of educational functioning consists of securing data from formal and/or informal tests in the appropriate skill areas related to developmental, pre-academic, academic, pre-vocational, or vocational levels of performance. Consideration shall be given both to the language of instruction and to the pupil's demonstrated dominant language when selecting measures of educational functioning.

Assessment instruments from the following list must be used whenever an individual assessment of intelligence is necessitated in order to meet the eligibility criteria for specific handicapping conditions. It has been our operating guideline to require only group intelligence tests to establish normal intelligence as required for eligibility for five of the six handicapping conditions. The eligibility criteria for the sixth handicapping condition, mental retardation, are the only ones which specifically require individual assessments of intellectual functioning.

Verbal Scales	Ages
1. WISC (Verbal)	5-15
2. WAIS (Verbal)	16+
3. WPPSI (Verbal)	4-6
4. WISC-R (Verbal)	5-16
5. Stanford-Binet	2+

Performance Scales	Ages
1. WISC (Performance)	5-15
2. WAIS (Performance)	16+
3. WPPSI (Performance)	4-6
4. WISC-R (Performance)	5-16
5. Stanford-Binet	2+
6. Arthur Point Scale	5-15
7. Hiskey-Nebraska	3-16
8. Leiter Intelligence Performance Scale	
9. Ravens Progressive Matrices	

Adaptive Behavior Scales

1. Mercer Scales

Permission for the use of other tests on a pilot or experimental basis may be obtained through the Commissioner of Education. Suggestions for additions to this list may be submitted to the Commissioner of Education for consideration and presentation to the State Board of Education for approval. Local professional judgment must be exercised in selecting the tests from the approved list which are most appropriate for the individual child being assessed.

When it has been determined through comprehensive appraisal of language dominance that a student's dominant language is other than English, appraisal instruments should be administered in the other language. Where no clear dominance is demonstrated, appraisal instruments should be administered in both English and the other language. When translating an instrument from English to another language, every effort must be made to maintain the original intent and purpose of each item. Interpretation of scores derived from translated instruments must take into consideration possible errors or inconsistencies in literal or conceptual translation. The examiner for such appraisal shall be fluent in both English and the language of the student, and sensitive to the differences in culture of the student which may affect the appraisal.

APPRAISAL OF EARLY CHILDHOOD HANDICAPS

Since the general Texas Education Agency guidelines include no specific criteria for establishing Early Childhood Program Eligibility, the following clarification and definition has been developed by the TCASE Appraisal Advisory Sub-Committee on Early Childhood for consideration.

Texas Education Agency Reference for Establishing Early Childhood Programs (Bulletin 711--December 2, 1974 Policy Change):

Exceptional Children are children between the ages of 3 and 21 inclusive with educational handicaps (physical, retarded, emotionally disturbed, or children with language and/or learning disabilities) as specifically defined within this policy; autistic children; . . . which disabilities render regular services and classes of the public schools inconsistent with their educational needs.

Proposed Clarification of Guidelines:

Early Childhood Education for the Handicapped is a program for children age 3 to 5 on or before September 1st who meet the eligibility criteria in one or more of the following areas which predict failure upon entry into regular school programs:

- a) Mentally Retarded
    - Educable
    - Trainable
- b) Emotionally Disturbed
- c) Physically Handicapped
    - Visually
    - Auditorially
    - Orthopedically
    - Minimally Brain Injured
- d) Speech Handicapped - including those children who exhibit a developmental delay in language acquisition.
- e) Language and/or Learning Disabled
  (A written report of educational assessment substantiating a discrepancy between age level expectancy and current educational performance may not necessarily apply to pupils 3 through 5 years of age. Bulletin 711, p. 11.)

Additional study done by the Appraisal Advisory Sub-Committee on Early Childhood

Upon gathering and reviewing curriculum guides from the Military ISD Cooperative, Edgewood ISD, San Antonio ISD, and Cluster V, talking with personnel from several other districts in Region 20, and studying the Peech Project and Outreach (by Tadscript), it was decided by the Early Childhood Sub-Committee that it was not necessary to develop an assessment model and test battery for Early Childhood since there were already several excellent models to choose from.

The Northeast Regional Resource Center has already prepared an Early Childhood Assessment List that includes "...assessment devices that may be used with children between 0 and 60 months (pre kindergarten years). The scales and tests have been reviewed and briefly annotated." Sixty assessment tools are reviewed in this publication. However, there are several additional assessment tests and scales being used by Region 20 school districts that are not listed in NRRC's publication. They are the following:

Auditory Comprehension of Language (Carrow)
BCP (Behavioral Characteristics Progression)
Callier - Azuza Scale
Dallas Pre-School Screening Test
Del Rio Language Screening Test
Developmental Syntax Program
Northwestern Syntax
School Readiness Survey
Screening Assessment of Educational Needs (Bangs)
Sheridan Developmental Chart
The Language Facility Test
Van Riper Predictive Test of Articulation
Vocabulary Comprehension Scale

The following are addresses to which districts may write for appraisal models and teaching methods for the Early Childhood level:

1. Early Childhood Assessment List
    Texas Regional Resource Center
    211 East Seventh Street
    Austin, Texas 78701

2. Peech Project
    Colonel Wolfe Preschool
    403 East Healey
    Champaign, Illinois 61820

3. Outreach - Replicating Services for Young Handicapped children
    TADS
    University of North Carolina
    500 NCNB Plaza
    Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

4. Free publications of materials to be used by persons working with handicapped young children
    Helen Knight
    TADS
    625 W. Cameron Avenue
    Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

5. An Individual Curriculum Guide
    Early Childhood Education for Handicapped ($6.00)
    Edgewood Independent School District (Dr. Jose A. Cardenas)
    3300 Ruiz
    San Antonio, Texas 78237

Another topic discussed by the Early Childhood Sub-Committee was the importance of emphasizing assessment of the child's language competence and performance (as language is a facilitator in cognitive development and a predictor of academic success). As districts in Region 20 are very aware of and concerned about accurately assessing the language of our bilingual children, some school districts are beginning to develop locally normed Spanish and English language-screening instruments. One such instrument has been completed - the Del Rio Language Screening Test. Also, Cluster IV is presently in the process of standardizing a Spanish/English language proficiency screening test with the help of Dr. Allen Toronto.

In harmony with assessing language of Early Childhood students is the concern for valid hearing tests. If pure-tone testing is not possible, then impedance audiometry or other techniques should be utilized. If a certified audiologist is not available within the district, perhaps an audiologist's services could be contracted.

3-11-76

APPRAISAL OF LANGUAGE AND/OR LEARNING DISABILITIES
Proposed Interpretation of Guidelines

Within the general Texas Education Agency guidelines for establishing LLD eligibility, as outlined in Bulletin 711, the following interpretation and definition has been developed by the Region XX CASE Appraisal Advisory Subcommittee on LLD and is submitted for consideration.

Texas Education Agency Criteria (Bulletin #711)

(1) Written report of assessment showing total intellectual functioning not more than two standard deviation units below the norm.

(2) A written report of assessment revealing evidence of a deficit or deficits in one or more of the basic psychological learning processes of auditory, visual or haptic processing, intersensory integration and/or concept formation.

(3) A written report of educational assessment substantiating a discrepancy between age level expectancy and current educational performance. This criterion may not necessarily apply to pupils ages 3 through 5 years of age.

(4) Documented evidence must be offered to indicate that the child's learning style deviates so markedly from the norm of his age group that he requires Special Education intervention.

(5) Physician's written report of general medical evaluation.

Proposed Interpretation of Guidelines:

(1) Total intellectual functioning should be represented by a score not more than two standard deviation units below the norm on recognized, standardized individual test(s) of global intellectual development. The examiner should use careful judgement in determining the child's potential or mental age level expectancy, particularly where the potential is estimated to be higher than test scores indicate. The score derived from such standardized tests as well as documented, clinical evidence may be used to determine a child's potential or mental age level expectancy.

(2) The appraisal person must document through formal and/or informal testing, and observations during testing and/or in the classroom, one or more deficits in the basic psychological learning processes which would cause a reduction in academic performance. Auditory and visual acuity are not considered process deficits. (See eligibility criteria #5).

The following are examples and are not meant to be all inclusive:

Auditory processing may include, for example, auditory memory, auditory sequencing, auditory reception, auditory association, auditory comprehension, auditory closure, auditory discrimination, and auditory fusion.

Visual processing may include, for example, visual memory, visual sequencing, visual closure, visual discrimination, visual reception, position in space, temporality-spatiality, figure ground, and form constancy.

Haptic processing is defined as taction, which is the sense of touch, kinesthesis, which is awareness of muscle movement, proprioception, which is position in space of own body or its parts or stereognosis, which is the ability to determine shapes from touch. Further development of haptic processing results in establishing concepts of laterality and directionality.

Intersensory integration is the "inner process whereby one type of neurosensory information is converted into another." It may include association, expressive language (oral and written), or shifting from one modality to another.

Concept formation is the ability to process information from previously encountered experiences and, by combining data determined to be appropriate to a different set of circumstances, form a unique concept related to the new situation. It may include the ability to abstract, categorize, or generalize.

(3) Age level expectancy should be interpreted as estimated ~~potential or~~ mental age as determined in intellectual assessment (refer to eligibility criteria #1). A difference of 1 standard deviation or more between a pupil's estimated mental age (which may be represented by a standard score on an intelligence test) and the standard score on achievement tests measuring one or more basic learning skill(s) would be considered a significant discrepancy.

Areas of basic learning skills should include reading comprehension, word recognition, arithmetic, spelling, written language, and language development (receptive and expressive). Although standard scores may not be available in documenting deficits in written expression and language development, clinical observations may be used in lieu of standard scores. In determining a child's level of functioning in basic learning skill(s) the actual level of classroom academic performance must be documented and considered when it varies from the levels determined by individual testing. This is especially important at the primary grades. This criteria may not necessarily apply to children three through five years of age.

(4) The learning style with which a child selects and processes information in the learning situation may be defined as a method or approach uniquely his. To meet LLD criteria, there should be evidence that because of the identified process deficits or other factors (such as inattention, anxiety, distractibility, hyperactivity...) the child learns in a manner so different from most children that in order to make progress in the basic skills, the child must receive Special Education intervention. Written evidence of the child's unique learning style may be obtained and confirmed from referrals, observations, and/or individual testing.

(5) A physician's written report of general medical evaluation should indicate that there are no medical or physical conditions which would be the primary contributing factor affecting the student's achievement or psychological learning processes.

Children with auditory or visual acuity problems may be considered for the program if it is determined by qualified specialists that this is not the primary contributing factor to the learning problem.

In meeting the above criteria, the items discussed under Comprehensive Individual Assessment, TEA Bulletin #711 would be considered, including intelligence factors, educational functioning, and medical and health factors. In addition, the requirement for a comprehensive appraisal of sociological variables (including information regarding cultural life style), must be met and, when appropriate, emotional and/or behavioral factors should be considered.

ADDITIONAL TOPICS CONSIDERED BY THE LLD SUBCOMMITTEE

I. Certain aspects of the Speech and Hearing Therapy category as they relate to screening and placement procedures were examined, resulting in the following recommendations:

(1) The screening process shall have built into it procedures for obtaining speech, language, and hearing data.

(2) A person with certification and training to interpret the gathered data in hearing, and/or speech, and/or language, shall be included on committees considering said information.

(3) In situations where there is a question of placement with an LLD teacher or a Speech Therapist, the decision of which is the most appropriate placement should be a function of the ARD Committee and is dependent on the individual child's needs. Placement with an LLD teacher or Speech Therapist should not preclude placement with both if this is deemed necessary.

II. Refer to Texas Education Agency's Administrative Guide and Special Education Handbook, Bulletin #711, page 9, for guidelines for establishing eligibility in programs for Minimally Brain-Injured Children.

III. TEA requires that children must be comprehensively reappraised at least every three (3) years in order to continue receiving Special Education services. For continued L/LD placement, the same factors must be assessed as outlined in the Specific Eligibility Criteria for initial placement:

1) Intellectual functioning.
2) Identification of process deficits
3) Discrepancy between expectancy and educational performance.
4) Documentation of a deviant learning style.
5) Written report of physical examination

The discrepancy between age level expectancy and current educational performance need not be as large as at the time of initial placement, since the child is expected to make progress with Special Education support.

All other items included under Comprehensive Individual Assessment, Bulletin #711, page 14, must be renewed with a reappraisal. In the case of "sociological variables," family background information should be updated as a part of the continuing communication with parents. When emotional and/or behavioral factors appear to contribute to the learning problems, these should be considered during reappraisal.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

I. Recommendation to TEA

Re: Physical Examination

When placement in an L/LD Program is being considered, it should be a function of the screening committee to determine, in each individual child's case, if a physical examination should be required.

II. In addition to the issues which are addressed in this document, this committee recommends that a subcommittee for Speech, Language, and Hearing services be formed. Clarification of this recommendation will be presented by a member of this committee to the Steering Committee.

III. It is recommended that each district develop specific criteria for dismissal from the L/LD program. It is strongly suggested that before dismissal, each student be given a trial period in the regular classroom during which time the Resource teacher will monitor the child's progress.

APPRAISAL FOR THE MENTAL RETARDATION PROGRAMS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
Proposed interpretation of guidelines 3/11/76

Within the general Texas Education Agency guidelines for establishing pupil eligibility for Mental Retardation programs, the following revisions are suggested for TEA Bulletin #711 by the Region XX Appraisal Advisory Sub-committee on Mental Retardation and is submitted for consideration.

EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED

(1) A written comprehensive report of intellectual assessment revealing deficits between two and three standard deviation units below the mean on verbal scales, performance scales, and adaptive behavior scales.

(2) A written report of educational appraisal which will include assessment of abilities and disabilities with instructional and behavioral recommendations for teaching which describe the educational environment and specific methods and strategies to maximize learning.

(3) A physician's written report of general medical evaluation.

TRAINABLE MENTALLY RETARDED

(1) A written comprehensive report of intellectual assessment revealing deficits of three or more standard deviation units below the mean on verbal scales, performance scales, and adaptive behavior scales.

(2) A written report of educational appraisal which will include assessment of abilities and disabilities with instructional and behavioral recommendations for teaching which describe the educational environment and specific methods and strategies to maximize learning.

(3) A physician's written report of general medical evaluation.

THE COMPREHENSIVE REPORT OF INTELLECTUAL ASSESSMENT

(1) General Appraisal Factors

The examiner should use careful judgement in determining the child's abilities and disabilities submitting documented evidence to support this determination of intellectual functioning.

The intellectual assessment must include documented evidence derived from formal and/or informal testing as well as observations made during testing, in the classroom, and/or other areas of the child's environment. This evidence must confirm that there are deficits in verbal, performance and adaptive behavior areas.

Particular care should be taken to identify apparent causes for deficiencies, since no individual is to be placed in special education if the deficiency is primarily attributable to a lack of educational opportunity, failure to achieve from previous educational experiences, a different cultural life style, or if the criteria for placement in Special Education is based solely on the command of the English language.

All testing or other elements of appraisal must be conducted in the pupil's primary language to insure maximum understanding of appraisal tasks. The examiner, therefore, must make a positive determination of the dominant language and his degree of proficiency in that language before administering any further appraisal instruments. The examiner's choice of appraisal instruments must allow the pupil to receive all directions for testing and allow all his responses to be in the dominant language.

(2) Intellectual Functioning

The comprehensive appraisal of intellectual functioning consists of individually administered test(s) of mental ability designed to assess a wide range of intelligence factors from verbal scales/items, performance scales/items, and adaptive behavior scales/items. Adaptive behavior is the effectiveness or degree with which the individual meets and is able to function within the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of her or his age and cultural group.

Data to determine intellectual functioning is not gathered from single-area reference test(s) such as vocabulary, strictly verbal tests, or strictly perceptual-motor tests. Such instruments may be used as a part of or in addition to a comprehensive battery to assess a wide range of intelligence factors, but they may not be used to determine total intellectual functioning for the decision-making process.

General appraisal

Sociological variables should be considered and reported in the appraisal process with data obtained through communication and cooperation with the family. The identification of factors within the family dynamics or home environment that influence the development of the child's learning or behavioral patterns are vital to the child's overall functioning and are important in designing modifications for educational planning.

Comprehensive appraisal of emotional and/or behavioral factors consists of data gathered from psychological and/or medical sources, teacher observation, and/or family information. This information is obtained and included in the appraisal report when a behavioral and/or emotional problem is perceived or suspected by either the referring party, screening committee, appraisal personnel, or as required to meet eligibility criteria.

THE REPORT OF EDUCATIONAL APPRAISAL

(1) Educational Functioning

The educational appraisal shall delineate specific abilities and disabilities which have been determined by formal or informal appraisal instruments administered within a group or individually; observations of the functioning within a clinical setting, in the classroom or other environments to which the appraisal person has access; and records of academic and behavioral ability available from school accounting sources. Consideration shall be given to both the language of instruction and the pupil's demonstrated dominant language when choosing instruments to appraise the educational functioning.

The acquisition of information used to determine abilities and disabilities should define levels of competency within the areas of the learning skills necessary to academic functioning including reading recognition, reading comprehension, spelling, arithmetic, written and spoken language, general information, and other skill areas as may be appropriate to the pupil's course of study including pre-vocational or vocational performance.

(2) Report of Educational Appraisal

The written report of educational appraisal should include specific recommendations of behavioral and instructional modification to maximize learning. These recommendations, based on the strengths and weaknesses determined, should describe methods and strategies appropriate to the environment needed to realize the educational potential of the individual and should be sufficiently specific for the development of an appropriate educational plan.

THE PHYSICIAN'S REPORT OF GENERAL MEDICAL EVALUATION

Comprehensive appraisal of health factors consists of medical assessment and diagnosis of the student's physical condition, intended to reveal factors which have influence on student achievement and/or adjustment. This information is obtained when a health problem is perceived or suspected by either the referring party, screening committee, appraisal personnel, or as required to meet eligibility criteria.

APPRAISAL OF THE EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED
PROPOSED INTERPRETATIONS OF GUIDELINES 10/13/75

Within the general Texas Education Agency guidelines for establishing ED eligibility, as outlined in Bulletin 711, the following interpretation and definition has been developed by the Region 20 CASE Appraisal Advisory Sub-Committee on ED for consideration.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY CRITERIA (Bulletin 711)

(1) Written report of psychological appraisal performed by a psychologist resulting in a diagnosis of emotional disturbance and prescription for behavioral management.

and/or

(2) Written report of medical appraisal resulting in psychiatric diagnosis and prescription for behavioral management.

(3) Written comprehensive intellectual assessment revealing no significant deficits in essential learning processes except as may be attributable to the emotional disturbance and not primarily to intellectual handicap, sensory or motor handicap, or lack of opportunity to learn.

(4) Written report of educational appraisal which will include assessment of abilities and disabilities and instructional and behavioral recommendations for teaching which describe educational environment and specific methods and strategies which will maximize learning.

(5) Physician's written report of general medical evaluation.

PROPOSED INTERPRETATIONS OF GUIDELINES:

(1) & (2) The "written report of a psychological appraisal performed by a psychologist" should include the results of the tests deemed appropriate by the psychologist. The psychologist may use material from classroom observations, teacher comments, information from parents, interview with the student, etc. to supplement, but not substitute for, the test results except in cases where the child is unable to function in a standardized testing situation .

A "diagnosis of emotional disturbance" should consist of a statement by the psychiatrist or psychologist indicating that emotional disturbance is causing the child's behavior to deviate from the norm to the degree that intellectual functioning is depressed and/or inappropriate behavior is present. If the psychiatrist or psychologist considers that it is appropriate or necessary, the child may be qualified under one of the categories of emotional disturbance given in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Second Edition (DSM-II) published by the American Psychiatric Association.

The "prescription for behavioral management" should include functional and practical management strategies, as well as long-term management goals.

(3) The "written comprehensive intellectual assessment" should include a recognized standard individualized test of global intelligence. "No significant deficits in essential learning processes except as may be attributable to the emotional disturbance" is considered to mean that the child does not qualify for special education placement under the criteria for Language and Learning Disability, Mental Retardation, Physically Handicapped, and the child has had the opportunity to learn.

If an "intellectual handicap, sensory or motor handicap or lack of opportunity to learn" is present, but it is determined that the emotional disturbance is the primary factor interfering with learning processes, then the child would qualify as ED.

(4) The "written report of an educational appraisal" should include the results of standardized tests of educational functioning. Informal assessments of educational functioning made by either the teacher or the examiner are additional sources of information that may be utilized to assess abilities and disabilities.

APPENDIX VII

Committee Survey With No Final Report

SURVEY OF ROLES OF SUPPORTIVE STAFF
IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE APPRAISAL PROCESS

TO: Director Of Special Education

FROM: Committee on Role Defining of Supportive Staff, Advisory Committee on Appraisal Process, Region XX CASE.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return in the enclosed envelope. Any additional comments or ideas will be appreciated.

Material will be compiled to aid the committee in defining specific roles. All information will be considered confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Committee Members

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. GENERAL

1. How many supportive personnel does your cluster have ________?

2. Support personnel as defined by TEA, Bulletin 711 are: *

Supervisors ________________
Counselors ________________
Visiting Teachers ________________
Educational Diagnosticians ________________
Associate Psychologists ________________
Psychologists ________________

*Please indicate sub-totals in the spaces provided. The sub-totals in item #2 should equal the total in item #1.

B. SPECIFIC

1. The role of the school psychologist (Ph. D.)

   a. Describe the appraisal function that the school psychologist provides in your cluster ______________________________
   ____

   b. The opportunity (in terms of time and work load) for psychotherapy within your cluster is:
   (circle one) Great Moderate Light

   c. Psychologists do have some specific functions with respect to the ARD committee. Can the psychologists actively participate in all ARD functions?
   (circle one) Yes No
   If no, why not? ______________________________
   ____

2. The next items apply to school psychologists. These support personnel deal with:
(circle one)

		Most of the time	Some of the time	None of the time
a.	academic and learning problems	M	S	N
b.	curriculum planning	M	S	N
c.	consultation with teachers	M	S	N
d.	inservice training of in-cluster or in-district personnel	M	S	N
e.	community resources (agencies)	M	S	N
f.	preventive mental hygiene	M	S	N
g.	direct hands on work with exceptional children	M	S	N
h.	parent & group education or counseling	M	S	N
i.	case studies	M	S	N
j.	group counseling	M	S	N
k.	group testing	M	S	N
l.	individual testing	M	S	N
m.	administrative duties	M	S	N
n.	administrative consultation	M	S	N
o.	coordinating psychological services	M	S	N
p.	individual counseling	M	S	N
q.	research	M	S	N
r.	educational plans	M	S	N
s.	screening committee	M	S	N
t.	emotional and/or behavioral problems	M	S	N
u.	projective testing	M	S	N

3. Please attach a job description filed by your district.

C. SPECIFIC

1. The role of the associate school psychologist

   a. Describe the appraisal function that the associate school psychologist provides in your cluster ______________________

   ____

   b. Psychologists do have some specific functions with respect to the ARD committee. Can the psychologists actively participate in all ARD functions?
   (circle one) Yes No
   If no, why not? ______________________________________

   ____

2. The next items apply to associate school psychologists. These support personnel deal with:
   (circle one)

	Most of the time	Some of the time	None of the time
a. academic and learning problems	M	S	N
b. curriculum planning	M	S	N
c. consultation with teachers	M	S	N
d. inservice training of in-cluster or in-district personnel	M	S	N
e. community resources (agencies)	M	S	N
f. preventive mental hygiene	M	S	N
g. direct hands on work with exceptional children	M	S	N
h. parent & group education or counseling	M	S	N
i. case studies	M	S	N
j. group counseling	M	S	N
k. group testing	M	S	N
l. individual testing	M	S	N
m. administrative duties	M	S	N
n. administrative consultation	M	S	N
o. coordinating psychological services	M	S	N
p. individual counseling	M	S	N
q. research	M	S	N
r. educational plans	M	S	N
s. screening committee	M	S	N
t. emotional and/or behavioral problems	M	S	N
u. projective testing	M	S	N

3. Please attach a job description filed by your district.

D. SPECIFIC

1. The role of the special education supervisor

   a. Describe the appraisal function that the special education supervisor provides in your cluster ____________

   ____

   b. Special education supervisors do have some specific functions with respect to the ARD committee. Can the special education supervisor actively participate in all ARD functions? (circle one) Yes No

   If no, why not? ______________________________

   ____

2. The next items apply to special education supervisors. These support personnel deal with: (circle one)

		Most of the time	Some of the time	None of the time
a.	academic and learning problems	M	S	N
b.	curriculum planning	M	S	N
c.	consultation with teachers	M	S	N
d.	inservice training of in-cluster or in-district personnel	M	S	N
e.	community resources (agencies)	M	S	N
f.	preventive mental hygiene	M	S	N
g.	direct hands on work with exceptional children	M	S	N
h.	parent & group education or counseling	M	S	N
i.	case studies	M	S	N
j.	group counseling	M	S	N
k.	group testing	M	S	N
l.	individual testing	M	S	N
m.	administrative duties	M	S	N
n.	administrative consultation	M	S	N
o.	coordinating psychological services	M	S	N
p.	individual counseling	M	S	N
q.	research	M	S	N
r.	educational plans	M	S	N
s.	screening committee	M	S	N
t.	emotional and/or behavioral problems	M	S	N
u.	projective testing	M	S	N

3. Please attach a job description filed by your district.

E. SPECIFIC

1. The role of the special education counselor

   a. Describe the appraisal function that the special education counselor provides in your cluster ____________________

   ____

   b. Special education counselor do have some specific functions with respect to the ARD committee. Can the special education counselor actively participate in all ARD functions? (circle one) Yes No
   If no, why not? ____________________________________

   ____

2. The next items apply to special education counselors. These support personnel deal with: (circle one)

		Most of the time	Some of the time	None of the time
a.	academic and learning problems	M	S	N
b.	curriculum planning	M	S	N
c.	consultation with teachers	M	S	N
d.	inservice training of in-cluster or in-district personnel	M	S	N
e.	community resources (agencies)	M	S	N
f.	preventative mental hygiene	M	S	N
g.	direct hands on work with exceptional children	M	S	N
h.	parent & group education or counseling	M	S	N
i.	case studies	M	S	N
j.	group counseling	M	S	N
k.	group testing	M	S	N
l.	individual testing	M	S	N
m.	administrative duties	M	S	N
n.	administrative consultation	M	S	N
o.	coordinating psychological services	M	S	N
p.	individual counseling	M	S	N
q.	research	M	S	N
r.	educational plans	M	S	N
s.	screening committee	M	S	N
t.	emotional and/or behavioral problems	M	S	N
u.	projective testing	M	S	N

3. Please attach a job description filed by your district.

F. SPECIFIC

1. The role of the educational diagnostician

a. Describe the appraisal function that the educational diagnostician provides in your cluster ______________________

____

b. Educational diagnosticians do have some specific functions with respect to the ARD committee. Can the educational diagnostician actively participate in all ARD functions?
(circle one) Yes No
If no, why not? ______________________________________

____

2. The next items apply to educational diagnosticians. These support personnel deal with:
(circle one)

		Most of the time	Some of the time	None of the time
a.	academic and learning problems	M	S	N
b.	curriculum planning	M	S	N
c.	consultation with teachers	M	S	N
d.	inservice training of in-cluster or in-district personnel	M	S	N
e.	community resources (agencies)	M	S	N
f.	preventative mental hygiene	M	S	N
g.	direct hands on work with exceptional children	M	S	N
h.	parent & group education or counseling	M	S	N
i.	case studies	M	S	N
j.	group counseling	M	S	N
k.	group testing	M	S	N
l.	individual testing	M	S	N
m.	administrative duties	M	S	N
n.	administrative consultation	M	S	N
o.	coordinating psychological services	M	S	N
p.	individual counseling	M	S	N
q.	research	M	S	N
r.	educational plans	M	S	N
s.	screening committee	M	S	N
t.	emotional and/or behavioral problems	M	S	N
u.	projective testing	M	S	N

3. Please attach a job description filed by your district.

G. SPECIFIC

The role of the visiting teacher

1. Describe the appraisal function that the visiting teacher provides in your cluster ______________________________

2. Visiting teachers do have some specific functions with respect to the ARD committee. Can the visiting teachers actively participate in all ARD functions?
(circle one) Yes No
If no, why not? ______________________________

APPENDIX VIII

Region XX, Educational Service Center Follow-up

Education Service Center, Region 20
1550 N. E. Loop 410 — San Antonio, Texas 78209 — Telephone (512) 828-3551

MEMO

TO: Region 20 Directors of Special Education

FROM: Patti Myers

SUBJECT: Legal Materials

DATE: March 12, 1976

Enclosed you will find four items related to legislation or regulations affecting the administration of Special Education programs. Briefly, they are

1. a paper developed by Mr. Robert McNeil suggesting policies and procedures that may be implemented to meet the guidelines detailed by Policy Change #9 as related to Bulletin 711;
2. a brief summary of P.L. 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Act of 1975;
3. a copy of P.L. 94-142; and
4. a copy of the initial implementation regulations for the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.

As additional materials of interest come to me, I will be happy to share them with you.

Special Policies and Procedures

Developmental Education Enrichment Program (Special Education) interpretation and procedure for compliance with:

- Policy Change No. 9,
- Texas Open Records Law,
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.

Note: The content of the following written policies are developed solely for the school districts special education (DEEP) program.

I. Public Requests for Documents (Information)

The superintendent of schools is hereby designated as the custodian of all records, documents, writings, letters, memoranda, or other written, typed, copied, or developed materials possessed, assembled, or maintained by the school district. The superintendent may delegate functional responsibility related to the school "records" as he may so desire.

A. School personnel upon receipt of a request related to the school "records" shall immediately notify the superintendent of schools or other duly authorized representative of such request.

1. If the information requested is found to be public in nature it shall be released for viewing or reproduction on the premises.

    a. The party making the request is to be charged the cost of reproduction, if any, and any other expenses entailed in locating and retrieving the information.

    b. If the information is in active use or otherwise unavailable, the requesting party will be notified immediately upon its becoming available; however, in no case will the delay exceed forty five (45) days.

2. If the information is found not to be public in nature, the requesting party will be so advised and for no reason shall the information be released.

3. If unable to determine whether or not the information requested is public in nature, the superintendent is hereby authorized to request, on behalf of the school board, an opinion from the Attorney General's Office (Texas) as to the nature of the information.

    a. Such opinion requests will be made within ten (10) days of the original request for the information.

b. The superintendent shall notify the person requesting such information that an opinion is to be requested of the Attorney General and shall notify such person immediately upon receipt of an answer from the Attorney General.

II. Protection of the Rights and Privacy of Parents and Students

A. Release of Student Records and Information

1. Type of request (or release) to be honored:

a. To parent and/or adult student (18 years of age or older) - unconditional except for procedure outlined below, (2. a,b,c,d)

b. From other sources to the school - Parent permission in writing must accompany request by school to the other source,

c. From School District to School District - Parent must be notified of transmittal, of records to be transmitted, provided with a copy of records transmitted, if desired, and provided an opportunity to challenge the content of the record before transmittal, if desired,

d. From school district to other agencies, groups, individuals, etc. - Parent consent in writing required,

e. School Professional Staff actively involved in the students educational process may inspect, review and/or copy records. Care should be exercised to protect confidentiality of records,

f. Authorized Representatives of:

(1) the Comptroller General of the United States,

(2) the Secretary (HEW)

(3) an administrative head of an Education Agency or,

(4) State educational authorities,

have limited access to student records provided they sign a log indicating same.

2. Procedure for inspecting, reviewing, obtaining reproductions of student records:

a. All requests should be made to the appropriate campus administrator who will, in turn, notify the school superintendent and the appropriate Special Education (DEEP) Component Director.

Records may be inspected, etc., either on the local campus or at the appropriate component appraisal center by appointment. (Uvalde, Carrizo Springs, Eagle Pass)

b. Inspecting and reviewing of records will be permitted only on the premises and only in the presence of a school official capable of explaining the data contained therein.

c. Inspecting and reviewing of records by parties other than the student's parents and/or adult students shall be permitted only in compliance with state and federal law. ("Texas Open Records Law" and "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974")

d. Copies of desired records may be obtained at the appropriate site.

(1) parties requesting copies may be charged reproduction and retrieval costs.

(2) requests for copies by parties other than the student's parents and/or adult student shall be honored only after the legitimacy of the request has been established and the proper parent consent or notification has been completed.

(3) should it be necessary to transport records for the purpose of reproduction, then, the records shall be carried by a designated school official.

B. Plan for Counseling Parents or Guardian of Pupils Considered for Special Education

1. When a student is referred and/or screened out for consideration for special education services, professional special education personnel will notify the parent or guardian of the referral and/or screening. No act other than the referral and/or screening shall take place without parent or guardian approval.

2. At the time of parent notification, counseling will be provided to parents regarding the need for written parental permission and consent for release of information, comprehensive assessment, and placement. If the parent is agreeable, written permission to perform tests and consider student for placement will be obtained.

3. At the time of parent notification, counseling will be provided to parents regarding availability of records or other data, and parents right to examine and question same.

4. At the time of parent notification, counseling will be performed with regard to appeals procedures, including the parent's right to convene a campus ARD Committee to review the student's program, challenge the content of the records, or resolve other grievances.

5. Notification and counsleing, and any written communication or forms will be in the language best understood by the parent. (as requested by parent)

6. At a later conference, professional Special Education personnel will review assessment findings and ARD recommendations with parents and secure parental consent and written permission for placement. If, after appropriate review and counseling, parents indicate that they do not desire special education services for their child, special education services will be terminated.

III. Hearings and Appeals

A. All aggrieved parties shall be entitled to hearings and appeals regarding school controversies in which they are legitimately involved.

B. Procedure for resolving a grievance

1. AGGRIEVED PARTY - SCHOOL CONFERENCE

a. The aggrieved party should first contact appropriate school campus principal

(1) grievance should be clearly stated

(2) principal must immediately notify the Special Education Component Director and the Cluster Administrative Supervisor.

b. The school campus principal shall set a time and place for the conference convenient to all parties.

c. All involved parties have the right to request the presence of other individuals with information relevant to the situation or with decision making authority regarding the ruling, action or failure to act complained of.

d. Although this is a preliminary attempt to resolve problems in a more or less informal manner, some simple written documentation of the conference and the decisions rendered should be kept.

2. ARD COMMITTEE HEARING

a. If a grievance is not resolved at the Aggrieved Party-School Conference then the ARD Committee shall be convened.

b. All interested parties shall have the right to convene the ARD Committee for an official hearing.

(1) The aggrieved party shall file a request in writing with the campus principal or the special education component director for a hearing by the ARD Committee, which shall identify the ruling, action, or failure to act complained of; such request shall be filed within fifteen (15) days of the date on which notice of such action or ruling is communicated to the person requesting the hearing. (special education administrative supervisor must be informed)

(2) The officer receiving the request shall set a time and place for the ARD Committee hearing, such time shall not be less than fifteen (15) nor more than thirty (30) days from the date on which such request is filed and shall give notice of the time and place of the hearing in writing to all interested parties.

(3) All procedural requirements of TEA Series 7102.3 shall apply. (Hearings and Appeals)

c. Greivances directed at challenging the content of a students school records shall begin at the ARD Committee Hearing level.

C. Route of Appeals

1. FROM an AGGRIEVED PARTY - SCHOOL CONFERENCE
   TO the ARD COMMITTEE HEARING

2. FROM an ARD COMMITTEE HEARING
   TO the SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

3. FROM the SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS to the DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

4. Additional appeals shall follow the route prescribed by the Texas Education Code, Hearings and Appeals, 7103.2.

D. Written documentation of the deliberations and decisions of all hearings must be kept.

IV. Language Factor

A. Communication with the parents or guardian- of a special education student or a student being considered for special education services, verbal or written, shall be in the language best understood by the parent or guardian.

B. Testing or other pupil appraisal requiring verbal or non-verbal responses shall be conducted in the pupils best language (s). (Best Language is described as pupil's primary home language, the pupil's most fluent language, the language in which the pupil has the best speaking ability, and the language in which the pupil has the best capacity for understanding)

1. Should the test administrator not be fluent in the pupils best language (s), then a third party who is fluent in English and the pupil's best language (s) shall be utilized as an interpreter.

2. If an interpreter is used in the test situation, then extreme care shall be exercised to preserve the validity and standarization of the test.

EDUCATION DAILY
SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT

March 4, 1976

Capitol Publications, Inc., Suite G-12, 2430 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037 • Telephone: (202) 452-1600

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE UNITED STATES
1934

PART II:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

■

PRIVACY RIGHTS OF PARENTS AND STUDENTS

Initial Implementation Regulations

Title 45—Public Welfare

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

PART 99—PRIVACY RIGHTS OF PARENTS AND STUDENTS

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act regulations will be published in a series. This is a section of that series. Others will be published shortly.

Notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on January 6, 1975 at 40 FR 1208 setting forth the requirements to be met by an educational agency or institution to protect the privacy of parents and students under section 438 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended (added by section 513 of Pub. L. 93-380 and amended by section 2 of Pub. L. 93-568).

Three hundred and twenty-one letters of comment were received during the 60-day public comment period which closed on March 7, 1975. All comments were given consideration during the revision of the regulations.

A summary of the major comments received, pertaining to those sections of the Act on which regulations are required to be promulgated, follows in order of the sections numbered as in the final regulations. Each summary of comments is followed by a response which indicates whether or not a change has been made in the regulations. Technical changes, such as the renumbering of sections, are listed under those changes at the end of each section or subpart.

SUBPART B—AMENDMENT OF EDUCATIONAL RECORDS

1. *Section 99.10 Request to amend education records—Comment.* Several commenters indicated they were concerned that an educational agency or institution might use the informal proceedings under § 99.21 of the proposed rules to delay in providing the parent of a student or an eligible student with an opportunity for a hearing to seek the correction of education records.

Response. Section 99.21 of the proposed rules has been deleted. New § 99.10 states that if a parent of a student or an eligible student believes that information in the education records of the student is inaccurate or misleading or violates the privacy or other rights of the student, the parent or the eligible student may request that the educational agency or institution amend the records. The educational agency or institution must decide whether to amend the education records within a reasonable period of time of receipt of the request. If the educational agency or institution decides to refuse to amend the education records of the student, the agency or institution must inform the parent of the student or the eligible student of the right to a hearing. If concerned that the educational agency or institution is utilizing informal attempts to reconcile differences as a delaying tactic, the parent or eligible student may exercise his right to a hearing without benefit of the decision from any informal proceeding.

2. Section 99.11 *Right to a hearing—Comment.* A commenter suggested that the right to a hearing to seek the correction of information contained in the education records of a student be limited to permanent education records which are not more than three years old.

Response. The statute does not provide for such a time limitation. Section 438(a)(2) states that

> the parents of students who are or have been in attendance at a school of such agency or such institution are provided an opportunity for a hearing * * * to challenge the content of such student's education records, in order to insure that the records are not inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise in violation of the privacy or other rights of students * * *

In addition, the fact that the right is provided to parents of students "who * * * have been in attendance * * *" as well as to parents of students "who * * * are in attendance * * *" makes it clear that the right to a hearing may not be denied because the education records are more than three years old. The purpose of the hearing is "to provide an opportunity for the correction or deletion of any such inaccurate, misleading or otherwise inappropriate data contained * * *." in the education records of a student regardless of when the information was entered in the education records. No change has been made in the regulations.

Comment. A commenter recommended it be made explicit that when an educational agency or institution finds that information contained in the education records of a student is inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise inappropriate that the information must be corrected or deleted from the education records.

Response. New § 99.11(b) states that if, as a result of a hearing, an educational agency or institution decides that the information is inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise in violation of the rights of the student, the agency or institution shall amend the education records of the student accordingly, and so inform the parent of the student or the eligible student in writing.

Comment. A commenter requested clarification regarding whether or not a hearing could be requested by a parent of a student or an eligible student to contest the assignment of a grade.

Response. A hearing may not be requested by a parent of a student or an eligible student to contest the assignment of a grade; however, a hearing may be requested to contest whether or not the assigned grade was recorded accurately in the education records of the student. The "Joint Statement in Explanation of Buckley/Pell Amendment (Congressional Record" at S. 21488, daily edition, December 13, 1974) stated in part

> There has been much concern that the right to a hearing will permit a parent or student to contest the grade given a student's performance in a course. That is not intended. It is intended only that there be procedures to challenge the accuracy of institutional records which record the grade which was actually given. Thus, the parents or student could seek to correct an improperly recorded grade, but could not through the hearing required pursuant to this law contest whether the teacher should have assigned a higher grade because the parents or student believe that the student was entitled to the higher grade.

Other Changes. Section 99.20 of the proposed rules has been renumbered § 99.11.

3. Section 99.12 *Conduct of the hearing—Comment.* Several commenters expressed concern that the standards for the conduct of a hearing did not adequately satisfy due process requirements. The commenters recommended the inclusion of additional requirements to protect parents and students such as (1) specifying the period of time within which educational agencies or institutions must hold a hearing, (2) requiring that the hearing be held at a time and place convenient for the parent or student, (3) permitting the parent or student to be assisted by an attorney or other representative of his or her choice, (4) providing the parent or student with an opportunity to present evidence relevant to the issues, (5) requiring that the hearing be conducted by an official who is not an employee of the school, agency, or institution, (6) requiring that the hearing be conducted and the decision be provided in the primary language of the parent or student and (7) requiring that the decision be based solely on evidence presented at the hearing.

Response. New § 99.12 includes many, but not all of the recommended requirements. In some instances the recommended requirements have been modified. Section 99.12(a) states that the parent of a student or an eligible student shall be given notice of the date, place and time reasonably in advance of the hearing. An educational agency or institution must make a reasonable effort to schedule the hearing at a time and place which is convenient for the parent or eligible student and conduct the hearing in a manner that will not effectively prevent the exercise of the parents' or students' rights.

Section 99.12(c) states that a parent of a student or an eligible student shall be afforded a full and fair opportunity to present evidence which is relevant to the issues, and that a parent or an eligible student may be assisted or represented by an individual of his or her choice at his or her own expense, including an attorney.

Section 99.12(e) states that the decision of an educational agency or institution shall be based solely upon the evidence presented at the hearing. In addition, the decision must include a summary of the evidence and the reasons for the decision.

It was determined that it was not feasible to set a specific period of time within which each educational agency or institution must hold a hearing. It was felt that the requirement under § 99.12 (a) that a hearing be held within "* * * a reasonable period of time after the educational agency or institution has received the request * * *" provides adequate protection to parents and students.

It was determined that the requirement that the hearing be conducted by an agency or institutional official or other party, who does not have a direct interest in the outcome of the hearing, provides adequate protection to parents and students. Nothing in section 438 of the Act or this part would preclude an educational agency or institution from employing a hearing examiner to conduct the hearing; however, the decision to abide with the determination of the hearing examiner must be the decision of the educational agency or institution.

It was determined that the requirement that an educational agency or institution conduct a hearing and provide the decision in the primary language of the parent or student would in many cases be burdensome. A parent or an eligible student has a right under § 99.12 (c) to "* * * be assisted or represented by an individual of his or her choice at his or her own expense * * *." If a parent of a student does not speak English he or she could also be assisted by another individual who is qualified to serve as an interpreter. An educational agency or institution which serves students in an area where the primary or home language of the parents and students is a language, other than English, is encouraged, but not required, whenever possible to conduct the hearing and provide the decision in the primary or home language of the parents and students.

Other changes. Section 99.12 of the proposed rules entitled *Formal proceedings* has been retitled *Conduct of the hearing.*

SUBPART C—DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION FROM EDUCATION RECORDS IN HEALTH AND SAFETY EMERGENCIES

4. Section 99.21 *Conditions for disclosure in health and safety emergencies.—Comment.* Two commenters recommended that the regulations specify that the written consent of a parent of a student or an eligible student is not required for the disclosure of information from the education records of a student in a health or safety emergency.

Response. Section 99.21 states that an educational agency or institution may disclose information from the education records of a student without the written consent of a parent of a student or an eligible student in a health or safety emergency.

Comment. A commenter stated that the decision as to what constitutes a health or safety emergency should be left to the discretion of an official of an educational agency or institution.

Response. Section 99.21(a) states that an educational agency or institution may disclose information from the education records of a student in a health or safety emergency, but does not specify what constitutes a health or safety emergency. Each educational agency or institution must decide if there is a health or safety emergency which requires the disclosure of information from the education records of a student without the written consent of a parent of a student or an eligible student. Section 99.21(b) enumerates the criteria to be used by an educational agency or institution in making a decision as to whether or not to disclose the information without written consent.

Other Changes. Section 99.35 *Release of information for health or safety emergencies* of the proposed rules has been renumbered and retitled § 99.21 *Conditions for disclosure in health and safety emergencies.*

Effective date. These regulations shall be effective on March 2, 1976.

Dated: February 25, 1976

DAVID MATHEWS,
*Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare*

Subpart A—General

Sec.
99.1 Purpose.
99.2 Definitions.

Subpart B—Amendment of Education Records

99.10 Request to amend education records.
99.11 Right to a hearing.
99.12 Conduct of the hearing.

Subpart C—Disclosure of Personally Identifiable Information From Education Records in Health and Safety Emergencies

99.20 Prior consent for disclosure not required.
99.21 Conditions for disclosure in health and safety emergencies.

AUTHORITY: Sec. 438, General Education Provision Act, as amended, 88 Stat. 571-574, 1858-1862 (20 U.S.C. 1232(g)).

Subpart A—General

§ 99.1 Purpose.

The purpose of this part is to set forth requirements governing the protection of privacy of parents and students under section 438 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended.

(20 U.S.C. 1232(g))

§ 99.2 Definitions.

As used in this part:

"Disclosure" means permitting access or the release, transfer, or other communication of education records of the student or the personally identifiable information contained therein, orally or in writing, or by electronic means, or by any other means to any party.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(b)(1))

"Eligible student" means a student who has attained eighteen years of age or is attending an institution of postsecondary education.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(d))

"Institution of postsecondary education" means an institution which provides education to students beyond the secondary school level; "secondary school level" means the educational level (not beyond grade 12) at which secondary education is provided, as determined under State law.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(d))

"Party" means an individual, agency, institution or organization.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(b)(4)(A))

Subpart B—Amendment of Education Records

§ 99.10 Request to amend education records.

(a) The parent of a student or an eligible student who believes that information contained in the education records of the student is inaccurate or misleading or violates the privacy or other rights of the student may request that the educational agency or institution which maintains the records amend them.

(b) The educational agency or institution shall decide whether to amend the education records of the student in accordance with the request within a reasonable period of time of receipt of the request.

(c) If the educational agency or institution decides to refuse to amend the education records of the student in accordance with the request it shall so inform the parent of the student or the eligible student of the refusal, and advise the parent or the eligible student of the right to a hearing under § 99.11.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(a)(2))

§ 99.11 Right to a hearing.

(a) An educational agency or institution shall, on request, provide an opportunity for a hearing in order to challenge the content of a student's education records to insure that information in the education records of the student is not inaccurate, misleading or otherwise in violation of the privacy or other rights of students. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with § 99.12.

(b) If, as a result of the hearing, the educational agency or institution decides that the information is inaccurate, misleading or otherwise in violation of the privacy or other rights of students, it shall amend the education records of the student accordingly and so inform the parent of the student or the eligible student in writing.

(c) If, as a result of the hearing, the educational agency or institution decides that the information is not inaccurate, misleading or otherwise in violation of the privacy or other rights of students, it shall inform the parent or eligible student of the right to place in the education records of the student a statement commenting upon the information in the education records and/or setting forth any reasons for disagreeing with the decision of the agency or institution.

(d) Any explanation placed in the education records of the student under paragraph (c) of this section shall:

(1) Be maintained by the educational agency or institution as part of the education records of the student as long as the record or contested portion thereof is maintained by the agency or institution, and

(2) If the education records of the student or the contested portion thereof is disclosed by the educational agency or institution to any party, the explanation shall also be disclosed to that party.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(a)(2))

§ 99.12 Conduct of the hearing.

The hearing required to be held by § 99.11(a) shall be conducted according to procedures which shall include at least the following elements:

(a) The hearing shall be held within a reasonable period of time after the educational agency or institution has received the request, and the parent of the student or the eligible student shall be given notice of the date, place and time reasonably in advance of the hearing;

(b) The hearing shall be conducted by any party, including an official of the educational agency or institution, who does not have a direct interest in the outcome of the hearing.

(c) The parent of the student or the eligible student shall be afforded a full and fair opportunity to present evidence relevant to the issues raised under § 99.11, and may be assisted or represented by individuals of his or her choice at his or her own expense, including an attorney;

(d) The educational agency or institution shall make its decision in writing within a reasonable period of time after the conclusion of the hearing; and

(e) The decision of the agency or institution shall be based solely upon the evidence presented at the hearing and shall include a summary of the evidence and the reasons for the decision.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(a)(2))

Subpart C—Disclosure of Personally Identifiable Information From Education Records in Health and Safety Emergencies

§ 99.20 Prior consent for disclosure not required.

(a) An educational agency or institution may disclose personally identifiable information from the education records of a student without the prior written consent of the parent of the student or the eligible student only under the circumstances and for the purposes enumerated in section 438(b) of the Act. Among the situations in which prior written consent is not required is a health or safety emergency, subject to the conditions set forth in § 99.21.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(b)(1))

§ 99.21 Conditions for disclosure in health and safety emergencies.

(a) An educational agency or institution may disclose personally identifiable information from the education records of a student to appropriate parties in connection with an emergency if knowledge of the information is necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or other individuals.

(b) The factors to be taken into account in determining whether personally identifiable information from the education records of a student may be disclosed under this section shall include the following:

(1) The seriousness of the threat to the health or safety of the student or other individuals;

(2) The need for the information to meet the emergency;

(3) Whether the parties to whom the information is disclosed are in a position to deal with the emergency; and

(4) The extent to which time is of the essence in dealing with the emergency.

(c) Paragraph (a) of this section shall be strictly construed.

(20 U.S.C. 1232g(b)(1)(I))

[FR Doc.76-5658 Filed 3-1-76;8:45 am]

APPENDIX IX

Appraisal Awareness Seminars

APPRAISAL AWARENESS CONFERENCE

March 23, 1976

9:00 - 9:15	I -	Overview of Region XX CASE Project - Preston C. Stephens
9:15 - 10:30	II -	Discussion of Appraisal Process - Dr. Jack Harris
10:30 - 10:45		COFFEE BREAK
10:45 - 12:00	III -	Report of Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee
12:00 - 1:00		LUNCH
1:00 - 2:15	IV -	Clinical Assessment versus Observation
2:15 - 2:30		COFFEE BREAK
2:30 - 3:30	V	Where Do We Go From Here?

APPRAISAL AWARENESS SEMINAR

Evaluation

This year, as its project, Region XX CASE established an Appraisal Advisory Committee. Some main objectives of this committee were:

1. To recommend uniform eligibility standards for certain classifications for Special Education.
2. To suggest a list of recommended forms for consideration by the districts or clusters in the area.
3. To determine ways to speed up and make smoother the flow of records between districts on students transferring, and
4. To present answers to some of the legal questions concerned with the appraisal process.

In accordance with these stated objectives above, please respond to the following evaluation items:

PRE-SEMINAR PREPARATION

1. How familiar were you with the activities of this Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee before today?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

2. My attendance at this seminar is an expression of my interest in the appraisal process.

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

3. I was given ample information of the purpose of the seminar.

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

SEMINAR ACTIVITIES

4. To what degree were you made to feel comfortable?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

5. To what degree was the presenter objective in presenting the material?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

6. To what degree was the presenter successful in preparing you for an intelligent consideration of the stated objective of the seminar?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

POST SEMINAR ACTIVITIES

7. Did the seminar contribute to your professional growth?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

8. After today's discussion do you feel that districts/clusters in Region XX should strive for uniformity in eligibility standards.

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

9. Do you feel that districts/clusters in Region XX should strive to develop and implement common appraisal process forms?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

10. Do you feel that this seminar contributed to your understanding of what a model appraisal system should be?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

11. Do you see any way that the appraisal advisory committee's activities and this seminar will make your job somewhat easier?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

12. Have you found any evidence that any of the activities of the Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee has had impact on the appraisal process in your district/cluster?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

13. Do you believe that activities of this broad scope are helpful?

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

14. The results of the Region XX Appraisal Advisory Committee efforts should be shared with other sections of the State.

Not at all Very Much
1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX X

Pupil Transfer Between Districts

Education Service Center, Region 20
1550 N. E. Loop 410 — San Antonio, Texas 78209 — Telephone (512) 828-3551

MEMO

TO: Region 20 Directors of Special Education

FROM: Patti Myers PM

SUBJECT: Pupil Transfers

DATE: March 12, 1976

In order to facilitate the transfer of Special Education pupils among school districts in Region 20, Region XX CASE has asked me to collect the following information:

1. Who is the person in your district to contact to receive Special Education records (including resource and self-contained pupils)? ______________________ Name

2. If you are a Cluster Director, are you the person to contact to receive records on any Special Education pupil in the entire cluster? _____Yes _____No

   If you answered "No," please give the name(s) of the person to be contacted in each district/ component of your cluster.
   ____
   ____
   ____

3. From whom should a receiving district request the pupil's cumulative records? ______________________

4. Do you require any particular type of release form? _____Yes _____No

   If you answered "Yes," please attach a copy of the form.

Please return this questionnaire to Dr. Patricia Myers, Education SErvice Center, Region 20, 1550 N.E. Loop 410, San Antonio, Texas, 78209. When all data are collected you will receive a copy of the results.

Education Service Center, Region 20

1550 N. E. Loop 410 — San Antonio, Texas 78209 — Telephone (512) 828-3551

MEMO

TO: Directors of Special Education

FROM: Patti Myers PM

SUBJECT: Special Education Pupil Transfers

DATE: April 1, 1976

As requested by you, I have compiled a list of the contact persons from whom you should request special education and Pupil Cumulative Records when students transfer from one Region 20 district to another. Obviously, there are personnel changes from year to year and I would appreciate your notifying me of any such changes so that I can keep the list current. Thank you for your cooperation in compiling the list.

Serving Schools in 14 Counties — Atascosa, Bandera, Bexar, Dimmit, Frio, Kerr,
LaSalle, Maverick, Medina, Real, Uvalde, Wilson.

CONTACT PERSONS TO FACILITATE SPECIAL EDUCATION
PUPIL TRANSFERS IN REGION 20

District	Contact Person to Whom Requests Made for Special Education Records	Contact Person to Whom Requests Made for Receiving PCRs
Alamo Heights ISD	Ms. Brenda Atkins, Dir. of Special Education	Ms. Brenda Atkins**
Asherton ISD	Mr. Walter Blackwell, DEEP Office Carrizo Springs ISD	Building Principal
Bandera ISD	Ms. Wanda Morris, Records Secretary REACH Office, Kerrville ISD	Building Principal
Brackett ISD	Mr. Rodolfo De Luna, DEEP Office Eagle Pass ISD	Building Principal
Carrizo Springs ISD	Mr. Walter Blackwell, DEEP Office Carrizo Springs ISD	Building Principal
Center Point ISD	Ms. Wanda Morris, Records Secretary REACH Office, Kerrville ISD	Building Principal
Charlotte ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Cotulla ISD*	Dr. Jean L. Jordan, Pearsall ISD	Building Principal
Crystal City ISD	Mr. Walter Blackwell, DEEP Office Carrizo Springs ISD	Building Principal
D'Hanis ISD	Mr. Joe Farris, DEEP Office, Uvalde CISD	Building Principal
Devine ISD*	Dr. Jean L. Jordan, Pearsall ISD	Building Principal
Dilley ISD*	Dr. Jean L. Jordan, Pearsall ISD	Building Principal
Divide ISD	Ms. Wanda Morris, Records Secretary REACH Office, Kerrville ISD	Building Principal
Eagle Pass ISD	Mr. Rodolfo De Luna, DEEP Office	Building Principal
East Central ISD	Mr. Michael Peinemann	Mr. Michael Peinemann**

Edgewood ISD.	Ms. Judith Lozano	Building Principal***
Floresville ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Ft. Sam Houston ISD	Ms. Jane Irons	Building Principal
Harlandale ISD	Ms. Hattie Mae Kerbel	Building Principal
Hondo ISD	Mr. N. E. Woolls	Building Principal
Hunt ISD	Ms. Wanda Morris, Records Secretary REACH Office, Kerrville ISD	Building Principal
Ingram ISD	Ms. Wanda Morris, Records Secretary REACH Office, Kerrville ISD	Building Principal
Jourdanton ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Judson ISD	Ms. Janet Jackson	Ms. Janet Jackson**
Kerrville ISD	Ms. Wanda Morris, Records Secretary REACH Office, Kerrville ISD	Building Principal
Knippa ISD	Mr. Joe Farris, DEEP Office, Uvalde CISD	Building Principal
La Pryor ISD	Mr. Rodolfo De Luna, DEEP Office Eagle Pass ISD	Building Principal
La Vernia ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Lackland ISD	Ms. Lucinda Rood	Building Principal
Leakey ISD	Mr. Joe Farris, DEEP Office, Uvalde CISD	Building Principal
Lytle ISD	Mr. N. E. Woolls, Hondo ISD	Building Principal
Medina ISD	Ms. Wanda Morris, Records Secretary REACH Office, Kerrville ISD	Building Principal
Medina Valley ISD	Mr. N. E. Woolls, Hondo ISD	Building Principal

Natalia ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
North East ISD	Mr. Robert Tipton**	Building Principal
Northside ISD	Ms. Yvonne Katz	Building Principal
Pearsall ISD*	Dr. Jean L. Jordan	Building Principal
Pleasanton ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Poteet ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Poth ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Randolph Field ISD*	Dr. Pat Cunningham	Building Principal
Sabinal ISD	Mr. Joe Farris, DEEP Office, Uvalde CISD	Building Principal
San Antonio ISD*	Area I Ms. Catherine Leidig	Building Principal
	Area II Ms. Dolores Ortiz	Building Principal
	Area III Ms. Acelie Villarreal	Building Principal
Somerset ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
South San Antonio ISD*	Mr. W. B. Coleman	Mr. W. B. Coleman**
Southside ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Southwest ISD	Mr. William L. Stegall	Mr. William L. Stegall**
Stockdale ISD	Ms. Jewel Weitzel, Cluster 4 Office Harlandale ISD	Building Principal
Utopia ISD	Mr. Joe Farris, DEEP Office, Uvalde CISD	Building Principal

Uvalde CISD	Mr. Joe Farris, DEEP Office	Building Principal

*These districts use particular types of release forms; see attachments. Other districts require releases which meet State and Federal regulations.

**Please provide the name of the campus to facilitate the transfer of the pupil's cumulative records.

***Or, Records Department, Edgewood ISD.

CLUSTER XII

Pearsall ISD - Fiscal Agent

Cotulla, Devine, Dilley ISD's

PRESCRIPTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

PLAN - A CLUSTER XII

RELEASE OF INFORMATION

I hereby authorize the release of confidential information from the files of____________________________________,

whose address is____,

regarding____.

Such information is to be released to:

Such information is to be used for:

____

____

Method of transmission:

____

____

________________________ Date

________________________ Parent's Signature

________________________ Address

________________________ Telephone

FORM #3

RECORDS RELEASE OR REQUEST FORM

San Antonio Independent School District
Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974

Student's Name ____________________ Birthdate ____________ Date of Transaction ____________

Most Current Address of Student ____
Street City State

Grade at Time of Transaction __________ Date of High School Graduation (If Pertinent) ____________

Parent's or Guardian's Name ____

And Current Address ____

Last School Attended in this District ____

Date of Attendance ____________________

CONSENT FOR RECORDS RELEASE

I desire and acknowledge that school records/transcripts will be sent to:

____
Name of Person, Agency or Institution

____
Address City State

For the purpose of ____

____

____
Parent's or 18 yr. old Student's Signature

R/7/15/75

FORM #3

RELEASE OF RECORDS; FORM FOR REQUEST OF

- o To be completed on any student when records or a copy of records containing personally identifiable information is to be released to any persons other than the following list of legal distributions:

  1. other school officials, including teachers within the educational agency who have legitimate educational interests;
  2. officials of other schools or school systems in which the student intends to enroll, upon condition that the student's parents be notified of the transfer, receive a copy of the record if desired, and have an opportunity for a hearing to challenge the content of the record;
  3. authorized representatives of (i) the Comptroller General of the United States, (ii) the Secretary, (iii) an administrative head of an education agency, or (iv) State educational authorities;
  4. in connection with a student's application for, or receipt of, financial aid.

- o This form should be used when a student without a parent present withdraws with intent to enroll in a school outside the San Antonio Independent School District.

MILITARY I.S.D. COOPERATIVE

☐ Fort Sam Houston I.S.D. ☐ Lackland I.S.D. ☐ Randolph Field I.S.D.

Department of Student Resources

Date ____________________

RELEASE FORM

Student's Name ______________________________ Date of Birth _________________ Age ______

Parent's Name ____________________ Rank ______ Home Phone __________ Duty Phone __________

School ________________________ Grade ______ Teacher ______________________________

Signing Section I of this form allows the district checked above to secure records regarding your child. This will give the appropriate school staff a better understanding of your child. Section II, when signed, enables the district checked above to supply information should you be consulting an outside agency or a physician. It also enables the district to send records to other school districts should you move, thus helping to eliminate delays in placement in a new school.

I. I hereby give permission to the district checked above to secure past and present medical, psychological, and educational records regarding the above named child from any designated physician or agency which has accumulated such records in the past.

Name and Address of Physician or Agency:	Reason for Request:
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________
Parent or Guardian Date

II. I hereby give permission to the district checked above to release psychological, medical and educational records regarding the above named student to his physician or any agency which is designated to work with this child.

Name and Address of Physician or Agency:	Reason for Release:
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________
Parent or Guardian Date

MILITARY I.S.D. COOPERATIVE

☐ Fort Sam Houston I.S.D. ☐ Lackland I.S.D. ☐ Randolph Field I.S.D.

Department of Student Resources

Date ____________________

RELEASE FORM

Student's Name ______________________________ Date of Birth ____________________ Age ______

Parent's Name ____________________ Rank ______ Home Phone __________ Duty Phone __________

School ____________________ Grade ______ Teacher ______________________________

Signing Section I of this form allows the district checked above to secure records regarding your child. This will give the appropriate school staff a better understanding of your child. Section II, when signed, enables the district checked above to supply information should you be consulting an outside agency or a physician. It also enables the district to send records to other school districts should you move, thus helping to eliminate delays in placement in a new school.

I. I hereby give permission to the district checked above to secure past and present medical, psychological, and educational records regarding the above named child from any designated physician or agency which has accumulated such records in the past.

Name and Address of Physician or Agency:	Reason for Request:
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________ Parent or Guardian	______________________________ Date

II. I hereby give permission to the district checked above to release psychological, medical and educational records regarding the above named student to his physician or any agency which is designated to work with this child.

Name and Address of Physician or Agency:	Reason for Release:
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________	______________________________
______________________________ Parent or Guardian	______________________________ Date

APPENDIX XI

Rough Draft of Manual - Plus Rating Received on Field Testing

A MANUAL FOR
UNDERSTANDING THE SPECIAL EDUCATION
APPRAISAL PROCESS
(THE MODEL APPROACH)

INTRODUCTION

A student may not receive special education services unless the student is appraised and meets the eligibility criteria. The appraisal process is the heart of the special education delivery system and, as such, should be fully understood by everyone in education. This manual is designed to give an explanation to the procedures used in the appraisal process and the reasons why those procedures are followed.

The contents of this manual reflect the model appraisal system not necessarily the way it is always applied.

PART I - WHY SO MANY RULES?

This question, why so many rules?, is the hardest question for special educators to understand and the worst answered one in Texas today. It is hard to understand because of the volumes of rules and regulations governing all aspects of education. There are probably more court rulings, laws, policies, administrative directives, rules, regulations, and edicts concerning the operation of the public schools than any other institution or aspect of life in the world today.

Here are comments which reflect these rules in action:

1. "You must be sixteen to take driver education unless" . . .
2. "You are not a junior, so you cannot enroll in this course."
3. "I am sorry he must be five on or before September 1 or he cannot enroll in kindergarten."
4. "If you played football last year you are ineligibile for the varsity squad this year."
5. An annual audit report will be filed on all funds of the district.
6. "How can we identify the extra milk students if free lunch tickets will be the same color, size, and shape of all other meal tickets?"
7. "Did you really think, Jane, that we would let you come to school dressed that way?"

8. No books may be checked out after May 15.
9. "I'm sorry, Mrs. Jones, but your eighteen-year-old daughter says you can't see her records."
10. The Title I schools this year will be . . .
11. In order to join the local association you must also join . . .
12. "Why do we have registers anyway?"
13. The next fire drill will be obstructed, that means . . .
14. "Yes, I agree with you." "The builder should have told you that the district line was two houses south of your new home."
15. Would you repeat after me, I have not promised to pay . . .
16. "Do I get the $200 if I just have student observers or do I have to have a practice teacher?"
17. "One and one-half miles is a long way to walk, but my hands are tied."
18. "That is not an approved course, besides sex education is taught in other ways here at . . ."
19. "The recommendation of the calendar committee is not acceptable since there are only 150 days of instruction and . . ."
20. "I don't care if you do have twenty years of experience in California, you will still have to take Texas history."

The special educator has a hard time understanding how there can be any criticism of rules regarding special education when he is surrounded by rules governing everything in education from his minimum salary to his assigned parking space.

Unfortunately, the answer to questions raised about special education rules are usually worse than no answer at all. Typically, the agency is quoted, the legislature is blamed, the central office is cited, or the past is relived.

The answer is really simple. Rules and regulations governing special education are designed to be in the best interest of students.

Many of the rules and regulations are designed to prevent enrollment into special education programs students who do not meet the standards. It is fairly well agreed that it is worse to label a student handicapped who is not, than it is to deny placement to a student whose condition is questionable.

Special education funds are provided to solve or at least temper the effects of physical, emotional, or mental conditions found in students. These funds, in the form of staff, materials, and services are not to replace regular education or to solve all grouping problems. They are not provided to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio or to teach the slow learners.

Yes, the appraisal process is log jammed with regulations. It is also true that it may be easier to get a whole family on welfare than to place a student in special education. These rules or regulations are actually less numerous and in most cases more necessary than many other requirements for other aspects of education. Remember we are discussing the appraisal process. If it were your son or daughter, would the procedure be right?

PART II - WHAT IS THE APPRAISAL PROCESS?

To quote the Texas Education Agency (Bulletin 7-11, p. 13) "The appraisal process is an orderly and systematic continuum of services for pupils which provides for: referral, screening, data analysis and alternatives, comprehensive assessment, admission, review, and dismissal, dissemination, and evaluation.

Let's look at the various aspects of this process and see how it applies to a student being considered for special education services for the first time.

A. Referral - Seeing a Problem

It would be impractical, highly expensive, and possibly harmful to consider everyone for special education through some type of mass testing program. It is the philosophy of most experts on the matter that students should remain in regular education programs unless they need services. Even then the special education services should be at the lowest possible level (least restrictive).

Therefore, a student has to be referred or called to the attention of the appraisal personnel of the district before anything happens. Since this first step is so important it should be clearly understood by all concerned.

Ideally, the referral will be by the classroom teacher. In the case of team teaching, secondary students, or other arrangements where the student has several teachers; the referral may come from anyone of the teachers.

Referral authority is not limited to classroom teachers. The referral may be made by the parents. This is generally the case with pre-school students, students new to the area, or students with concerned parents (often overly concerned).

Referrals may be made by the librarian, nurse, principal, professional member of the community, public or private agencies, or, indeed, anyone who has a legitimate interest in the student. This includes the student himself.

The referral from the teacher is always to the counselor. Here it becomes the counselor's job to determine if something else other than special education intervention is needed. Since there are so many steps to follow before special education placement becomes a reality - the rule of thumb should be always "refer if in doubt."

Some of the reasons for referral may be:

1. Withdrawn behavior
2. Immaturity, as compared to peers
3. Failure to achieve academically

4. Inattention
5. Impulsive, driven tendencies
6. Socially unacceptable behavior
7. Sudden changes in personality

This is by no means a complete list. Care should be taken not to refer students who:

1. Have been fully appraised recently for the same problem noted by the present teacher
2. Are achieving in line with their apparent global ability; unless extremely low
3. Are new and haven't adjusted to their new surroundings unless problem is gross.

If in doubt talk to the counselor. This will eliminate improper referrals.

Yes, a formal referral does require the completing of the referral form. This is necessary in order to:

1. Provide a written statement of the problem so that the many persons involved in the appraisal process will be aware of the difficulties or concerns raised by referring party
2. Give the available information such as birthday, previous testing, etc., generally needed during the process
3. Make certain that the problem is clear enough to reduce to writing.
4. Give the counselor a written record of the case for review as the process proceeds

The parents must be notified that the referral has been made. This provides the assurance that the parents have been placed on notice that a problem may exist. It reassures the parents of the concern of the school. This requirement also allows the parents an opportunity to take steps outside of the school setting in seeking answers if they feel the need. Again, if it were your son or daughter wouldn't you appreciate this information?

B. Screening - Is It Really A Problem?

The model system has a good counselor who, in conjunction with the teacher, recognizes the problem as either one for possible special education intervention or redirects the problem to other alternatives. The counselor is not expected to do all of the work, but serves as the catalyst to make certain that the student referred obtains all of the help that the system has to offer as appropriate.

The teacher, if he or she made the referral, has already contacted the parent. The counselor will make what should be the second contact. Perhaps the difficulties observed by the teacher can be explained or a solution can be found. For example, the problem stated could be inattention, frequent drowsiness, and often irritable behavior. The parents may admit to the counselor that the child stays awake until the mother comes home from work at 11:00 p.m. or so. Often parents will admit things to a skillful counselor that they withhold from a teacher for reasons known only to them.

It is considered essential that the counselor talk with the parents face-to-face. Even a home visit may be helpful if the situation appears to warrant it.

The background information form must be completed at this time. This form can give valuable insight into many problems. Clear indications of development problems such as some forms of retardation or inherited tendencies such as some types of learning disabilities can be identified as suspects for the source of the problem by reading a properly completed background form. Even physically related problems can be pinpointed by this form (such as minimum brain injury). The background information form is confidential and should be treated as such. The form may show, for example, that the child with shy withdrawn behavior not only has the one stepfather found listed on the school enrollment records but has had three or four stepfathers in the last several years.

This background information can be so important that it should never be treated casually. Do not send it home by the child or hand it to the mother during refreshment time at a P.T.A. meeting.

This aspect of the appraisal is called the screening aspect because it is here that the majority of referrals will be ruled out (or screened out) for eventual special education placement. The next procedures in this process are to obtain a hearing and a vision test, obtain parent permission for individual testing, have the language statement signed, do the appropriate inschool screening testing and schedule a screening committee to review the case. Except for the screening committee to study the case being the last part of this aspect of the process, there is no set order for all of the rest to occur.

In order to be true to the promise of suggesting "the model" let's put all of these activities in sequence.

The parents were notified that a referral to the counselor was occurring. This notification automatically informs them that the screening process will take place. The counselor calls them in for a conference. At this conference the background information form is signed. Also the counselor should obtain the language statement and permission for individual testing if it is needed.

Next the vision and hearing channels should be checked. Here the nurse will check the vision to be certain that the student referred has no acuity problem. Please remember that a vision screening done by the nurse is only that - a screening test. If a student passes, it does not mean that he does not have a vision problem. It means only that he has acceptable distance vision and should be able to clearly see the chalkboard and other places in the room. Conversely, if a student fails the vision screening test it doesn't mean that he needs glasses or that glasses will solve his problem. It only means that a complete examination by a vision specialist must be done before the process can proceed. Please note that the district will pay for this complete vision test if the family is unable to do so.

The same standards apply to the hearing screening as well. The district cannot pay for treatment to correct conditions found by a hearing specialist or a vision specialist, but generally ways can be found to finance such intervention if the family is unable to do so.

The insistence on a hearing and vision screening with followup, where indicated, is in the best interest of the student. Students who have had poor vision or poor hearing generally do not know that they have this problem Often students can make remarkable progress, both academically and socially when such conditions are found and corrected.

Since each referral is different, each campus is different, and each student is different - no universal on-campus screening procedure is possible. In almost every case the student referred should be seen by the speech therapist if possible. Very often the problem can be related to oral or written language expression difficulties. It is possible that the intervention of a speech therapist can solve the problem raised by the teacher.

The speech education personnel assigned to the campus may wish to administer some screening instruments such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, the Wide Range Achievement Test, the Spache Diagnostic Test or other such tests. These can be helpful in determining whether the student may be a special education candidate, may have more problems or different ones than the classroom teacher suspected, or may reveal nothing not already known. Unfortunately, with turnover in personnel and demands on time it is not always possible to obtain this on-campus service.

The form that the counselor has for the parents to sign giving permission for individual testing and providing the language statement is necessary before the screening committee meets for several reasons. If the language statement indicates that the home language is other than English, the bilingual program may be the best route to take in obtaining help for the student. Certainly, using a language other than English at home could have real impact on the student's behavior at school. This possibility will be thoroughly checked before the appraisal process is completed even if the parents do not reveal that English is not their home language.

Whenever a parent agrees to individual testing, it usually means that they also feel the student has a problem. If they disagree with the referral this gives them an opportunity to express themselves at this time. Failure of the parents to agree to testing, which may not occur anyway, usually means one of several things:

1. The information assembled to date needs to be carefully studied to make certain that a problem does exist.

2. That the school has not done a good job keeping the parents informed of their child's progress or problems and renewed efforts should be expanded on this family.
3. That the case should be studied further to see if there are related problems not known to the school. For example, a mother having a divorce hearing pending may be unwilling to allow testing for fear the results could be used by her husband to reduce child support payments. Perhaps an older student several grades behind is receiving social security payments which would stop sooner if the student was placed in a special education program (cooperative work-study) where he could complete his high school diploma. The failure to sign may reflect a fear of what this testing may reveal about the other members of the family; such as child abuse, incest, mental illness of a sibling, alcoholism, or other closet-type situations. Each situation of a refusal to agree to testing should be a clear indicator to the counselor to dig deeper. Each such refusal should be called to the attention of the principal.
4. Such refusal to sign may indicate unhappiness with the progress shown by a sibling already in a special education program. If this is suspected, the special education administrator should be notified so that extra efforts could be made to determine if such a problem does exist.
5. It may mean that the family is divided on what is best for the child. If the contacts have always been with the mother, maybe the father should be invited in for a conference.
6. It may mean only that the family is not convinced of the problem.

Regardless of the reason two things are certain. Educators must always remember that the parents have the final authority in all matters related to special education for their children. Also that the appraisal process cannot continue against the wishes of the parents.

Assuming the referral is still valid and the road blocks have been passed - the student's case is now ready to take to the screening committee for the first formal action. The screening committee plays a key role in determining the future of the student. As such, proper importance should be placed on the makeup of the committee and the decision it reaches.

Administration must be represented on the committee because of this element's ability to implement various recommendations. For example, the screening committee may suggest that a different teacher be assigned, etc. An administrator from the special education department can meet the requirement but should be depended upon only if the principal, assistant principal, or administrative aide cannot be present.

The teacher making the referral should certainly be present. If for no other purpose, an update of the situation is indicated. It is not necessary for all the teachers working with the student to be present at this screening committee meeting but they should have input either orally through someone else, in writing, send copies of the student's work, or be called for reaction to a specific point if indicated.

Naturally the biggest question of a technical nature is whether the student should be tested for special education consideration. An appraisal person must be present to be a part of this decision.

Thus, administration, instruction, and appraisal must all be present. Since the counselor plays such a key role certainly he or she will be present. In our model plan the counselor will schedule the meeting, make certain all data is present, and chair the meeting.

The options of the screening committee are many. These include, but are not limited to:

1. Decide to appraise to determine special education eligibility
2. Hold decision until additional data is collectec (such as report of student's visit to a vision specialist)
3. Suggest an on campus change effecting his regular education schedule (such as a different teacher - no P.E., etc.)
4. Assign to special education personnel for diagnostic services
5. Ask one of the staff persons to do follow-up (such as the nurse to check out free lunch, the counselor to contact the father, the principal to check into child abuse, or the coach to talk with boy about his odor)

Should parents be invited to the screening committee? As a general rule no, since it would tend to slow the process. This option should be left open for the parents to attend if their presence could be useful. This decision should be exclusively left up to the principal. The same answer is applicable for the ARD Committee meeting.

The screening committee's decision sets the stage for the final aspect of the appraisal process for original entrance into special education - the Admission, Review, and Dismissal Committee.

C. Comprehensive Assessment - Is the Problem One for Special Education?

The next step in this sequence is to obtain all the data possible on the student, analyze the data, and reach a conclusion. This conclusion must be one that can be reduced to writing so that anyone having a responsibility for the student can have this information for their consideration.

The most important item of information to be obtained is the results of a complete medical evaluation. This should be obtained before individual assessment of an appraisal nature is attempted. Circumstances often prevent this until after individual testing is done. However, no student will be placed in special education without it. The medical examination purpose is twofold. To rule out medically related problems and to focus attention on medical problems for possible correction.

Unfortunately, most medical examinations are not very complete. Serious problems such as low blood sugar, neurological damage, and chemical inbalances are not usually found by routine medical checkups. However, the success ratio of finding problems of a medical nature is high enough to insist on this activity.

Financially, this is the parents' responsibility if at all possible. Where this is a problem, the district will assist.

In our attempt to give the ideal model for appraisal services, the doctor would be provided information on why the school was asking for the medical (to rule out physical problems), what the eligibility criteria is for special education placement, and any abnormal conditions the school has noted which should be investigated. As usual, a form is provided to inform the doctor and for him to use to send back to the school his findings.

Please note that the medical doctor is not being asked to determine the educational placement of a youngster. It is not the intent of this medical requirement to force the family doctor into approving or disapproving the actual decision of special education placement.

The individual testing part of the appraisal process is often surrounded by mystery. Appraisal people do things that "only they" can do, in a secluded place, and report results in a language only known to a few.

Actually it isn't that way at all. Appraisal personnel do have a job to do that they have spent years in college courses and in practical experience preparing to do. They are taught to administer and determine the results on a broad range of commercially produced tests. Their training is similar to a pharmacist who know what to mix to provide a workable medication.

Working in a quiet place out of the mainstream of the school is not for their convenience. Most appraisal personnel could administer individual instruments to an attentive subject in Yankee Stadium during opening day. The insistence on a quiet place is for the benefit of the student being tested.

Every campus should be prepared to provide the best testing facility available when one of the students from that school is being tested. If nothing else is available, the principal's office can be easily converted into a testing center for the time required.

The information obtained from the individual must be viewed in a proper context:

1. It is indicative of one test(s) to one student during a part of one day in his life under conditions different, if not completely strange to the student.
2. All tests have norms standardized over various segments of the population but never with students exactly like the one being tested.

3. The test(s) given will be just part of the complete assessment.

The appraisal personnel have an obligation to obtain results that reflect the student's true level not to find him eligible or ineligible. They are professionals provided by state funds to perform an essential service. It is not their responsibility to tailor the testing to meet the wishes of the parents, students, or other educators. To do less than the best job they can possibly do in determining the true picture of a student is unethical and grounds for dismissal.

The actual battery of tests used will vary greatly with the situation, the student, and the examiner. The following are some of the issues which must be taken into account:

1. What is the age of the student?

   Some test instruments are not valid for very young or for older students.

2. What physical limitations does the student have?

   It would be cruel to ask a blind student to do certain performance tests.

3. What testing has already been done?

   If valid testing done elsewhere is on file, it might be necessary to only fill in the gaps or to do only a limited battery to meet a specific need expressed by the screening committee.

4. What does the referral and other information already collected imply?

   Usually, the type of testing needed is geared to the minimum needed to qualify a student and write an educational plan.

   This is both cost effective and serves the student's needs best. The examiner is the expert so he or she should decide on what test(s) to give.

5. Does the testing indicate any condition not already suspected?

   If so, the examiner may need to consult with other appraisal personnel, do additional follow-up testing, or refer on to a different type of appraisal specialist.

6. Is the student able to present a valid picture in a testing situation?

   Accuracy is far more important than speed. Some students do not relate well to strangers. This may require several meetings to establish rapport before formal assessment can commence. The attention span may prove to be so short that the testing schedule will have to be so short that the testing schedule will have to be divided into several sessions. Even the physical health or the emotional condition of a student may dictate a different approach. On occasion testing must be scheduled off the campus at a central location or in the student's home to obtain valid results.

Basically, the appraisal person is looking for the answer to two questions: Does the physical, emotional, or mental status of the student require the intervention of a rather expensive service like special education? Does the student's profile lend itself to recommendation and if so what should those recommendations be? Regardless of the results of the appraisal, there should be concrete recommendations made by the appraisal person on every student he sees.

If the student does not meet the eligibility for special education services, the appraisal person must so state. If the student does meet the eligibility, it does not mean an automatic placement. The input of all educators knowledgeable of the student is needed before a decision of placement can be made. Special education is not designed for slow learners, underachievers, behavioral problems or students just troublesome to the classroom teacher.

In every case, an appraisal report will be provided to the home campus of the student. This will be a written report. Nearly all reports have five basic sections:

1. The Heading - Here the student is identified by name, age, date of birth, name of school, grade placement, and sex. Also included is the date of the testing, the name of the examiner and the person who made the referral.

2. A Statement of The Problem - This may look very familiar to the referring teacher. Unless it has been changed by the screening committee, the problem raised is the one to be resolved. Hopefully, the statement will be expressed in a way to invite a solution.

3. The Information Gathered - This section will generally have several subheadings. However, the information found here will include the background information and other sociological variables (if appropriate), the test administered by name, the test results by global statements (such as verbal, performance, and full scale scores or achievement scores expressed in years and months, etc.), the impression of the examiner, and other data which might prove valuable.

4. Conclusion or Summary - This section is generally short. It puts all of the pieces available to the examiner into one or two observations. It gives the impressions and facts that the examiner sees as the true picture of the student. Included will be the statement of the student's status for eligibility for special education.

5. Recommendations - This is the most important aspect of the report. It also carries the least weight. The examiner is professionally bound to make recommendations regarding the student as a result of the information gathered to this point. These recommendations are nearly always things to be carried out by others. In addition, the final recommendations are the province of the ARD committee. These recommendations of the appraisal person should never be ignored. They generally reflect the most carefully thought out remarks concerning individual students that are ever put in writing during a student's total time in the education system.

   Appraisal reports are easier to read and understand than group test scores recorded in cumulative records. They are certainly far easier to read than most educational articles found in educational journals. Familiarity is the key to understanding appraisal reports. Another good technique to developing a true understanding is to ask for clarification on any item. There are no dumb questions. The best friend a student has is one who can intelligently discuss the findings of the appraisal person.

5. Admissions, Review, and Dismissal - The Final Authority

   The two strongest concepts in education today are individualization and the team approach. Individualization guarantees that students will have their needs addressed on a personal basis. This is the philosophy behind grouping for instruction, providing electives, or even "try outs" for the band. The team approach guarantees that more than one opinion will be heard, that different frameworks will be represented, and that no one person will have the total responsibility.

   The admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) aspect of the appraisal process combines these two concepts. It is in effect a team representing different disciplines making a decision or several decisions about an individual student.

   In order for this team concept to function, there must be a gathering of the persons making this team. This is called the ARD committee.

   Just as on the screening committee; administration, instruction, and appraisal must be represented. Each component of the educational staff makeup must be represented to make this a true team approach.

   The appraisal person must be in attendance to defend the conclusion and recommendation sections of the appraisal report. Also they are expected to provide the committee with personal observations and insight to assist the other committee members in their deliberations.

   Certainly instructional personnel will be in attendance. This should include the referring teacher and at least one special education teacher. Anyone who has information pertinent to the case or anyone who might reasonably be expected to assist with the student as a result of the committee's deliberations should be present. Certainly a limit has to be placed. Flexibility and timing are keys in making certain that the right personnel are present.

The administrative component should be present and should chair the meeting. The administration will shoulder the burden of implementation of the recommendations regardless whether they involve changes in regular education programming, special education placement, or something outside of the school structure.

The importance of the counselor should not be overlooked at the ARD committee. The best information about the family can come from this source. The counselor will be expected to interpret the test results and to obtain final parental approval.

The name for this committee is very interesting and often forgotten by the committee members themselves when a difficult case arises. The admission nomenclature is simple. The committee can decide to place or refuse to place a student into special education. The review aspect and the dismissal authority is something else again.

To review means the ability for once again looking at all the data to reach a decision. Thus, an ARD committee should always be mindful of the possibility of reviewing a student's placement even before the original decision is made. Often a student may be eligible for special education but there is a real question as to whether he or she needs it or would profit from it. The ability to restudy the question at a later date can play an important part in making the original determination.

The dismissal aspect of the committee has little to do with the model for original placement. It is sufficient to say that a placement in special education is not a life sentence nor does meeting the eligibility criteria guarantee the permanent solution of the problem.

Several questions common to any ARD committee are:

1. What is our primary purpose?

   The primary purpose of the ARD committee when meeting on an original referral is to decide on the best educational placement for that student.

2. What are our options?

   The options available to an ARD committee are limited only by creativity limitations. The official one is to accept or deny placement in special education. The committee can request additional testing, recommend programmatic changes. ask for therapy for the student, or recommend a change of teacher or school assignment.

3. What if some members do not agree with the majority on the committee?

   The ARD committee form allows a place for a "disagree" position to be stated. It is a sign of real concern to see some difference of opinion expressed by this committee. Education is not an exact science.

4. Does the principal have the final vote?

   No, the team concept doesn't give the principal's vote any more weight than any other member. A principal who ignores the advice of his or her staff and who makes a decision on the personal bias or political expertize is on very thin ice.

5. What about the child who doesn't qualify but who still needs help?

   Special education is not designed to solve all the problems of education. All cases have solutions - finding them can be difficult. If a slow learner is failing, then maybe the curriculum should be revised in the student's classroom. If student behavior problems are a real concern of the school, perhaps inservice should be given to the entire staff.

   Repeated referrals from a teacher or students having difficulties but who do not qualify may indicate that the teacher needs supervision assistance. It may even indicate that that classroom needs a new teacher.

6. What happens if we approve the student for special education placement but the parents refuse?

   Parents, in our model system, have the final authority to accept or reject special education placement. A good counselor and a strong principal can obtain the necessary approval from even the most reluctant parents if the decision is correct for the student.

7. Aside from recommendations and decisions, do we have any additional responsibilities?

   Yes, the ARD committee should write the educational plan. Generally this means define the major areas to be addressed and the materials or methods to be used. The step-by-step teaching strategies would be too time consuming for such a team to accomplish.

FOLLOW-UP - PUTTING THE PLAN INTO ACTION

This section is provided only for reader clarification. All details on follow-up have been previously discussed in preceding sections. These additional comments are provided as they relate to a student who has been recommended for special education services.

The counselor will meet with the parents to interpret the test results, the decision of the ARD committee, and obtain the final agreement of the parents. The counselor will utilize the principal, the appraisal person, the special education teacher(s), or the regular teacher to assist in this if needed.

The educational plan will be finalized by the special education staff with the assistance of the appropriate appraisal person. This plan will include the amount of time necessary for special education instruction.

Mechanical details will be solved as the situation demands. Special education transportation will be arranged if indicated. The cumulative records plus the special education records will be sent to the receiving school if the student is being transferred to another campus.

The educational plan will be formally reviewed every three months or sooner if indicated. The ARD committee will automatically review the placement near the end of the school year (unless placement occurred during the last three months of the year).

SUMMARY

Yes, the appraisal process is structured and involved. Yet, there are no forms not essential in most cases nor any steps unnecessary in the entire procedure. What could be changed to speed up the activities without losing sight of the best interest of the student? The informal lines of communication are always open. Any special education teacher or appraisal person should be expected to provide suggestions, recommend material, or to discuss any student with other educators when called upon to do so.

Many states have or are considering adopting a program of special education based on the Texas plan. Several states who have had court rulings imposed on them wish that they already had such appraisal process as outlined in this manual in operation.

Hopefully, the time spent reading this manual has not been wasted. If you can assist the appraisal process in this district to become closer to the model, your time will have been well used.

North East Independent School District

10333 BROADWAY · SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78286

DEPARTMENT OF
STUDENT RESOURCES

Counseling & Guidance
Health Services
Appraisal Services
Special Instruction
Center School

March 2, 1976

Enclosed please find three items:

- A booklet entitled "A Manual for Understanding the Special Education Appraisal Process".
- A rating scale on the manual.
- An envelope to mail the rating scale back to me.

Please do me a favor. Read the manual, fill out the rating scale and return it to me. Frankly, I hope you like the manual and it enlightens you on the appraisal process. If it misses the mark; I need to know this.

This manual is designed to be used in North East School District and to have abailable for use by any district in Region XX. It is not copyrighted since it is a publication of the district.

My reason for asking your reaction is simple. If it proves to be helpful I can defend the cost of its publication and distribution. If it proves to be a waste of time, I would rather know now and spend time and money elsewhere.

Please take the twenty or so minutes that this activity will require and send this form back to me by next Monday. I would like to have the manual ready for distribution this April if the survey justifies it. Please be frank, I would be if you asked me to rate such a document.

Sincerely,

Preston C Stephens

Preston C. Stephens
Director of Student Resources

es
enclosures - 3

Rating Received

Fill out this rating scale by circling your choice. The higher the number you circle the more you agree with the statement. A "3" circled means no opinion.

4.4 1. This manual provides a clearer understanding of the appraisal process than I had before reading it.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.9 2. The manual presents the appraisal process in a logical sequence.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.4 3. The absence of any reference to Texas laws or T.E.A. rules, as a requirement for each step of the appraisal process, made the manual more meaningful.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.7 4. The model appraisal process proposed in the manual would be helpful for this campus (district).

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.0 5. The manual would be helpful to parents.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.7 6. The manual would be helpful to administrators.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.7 7. The manual would be helpful to counselors.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.7 8. The manual would be helpful to appraisal personnel.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.5 9. This manual presents an appraisal process the way I would like to see it or the way we have it now in my school /district/.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4.9 10. I would recommend this manual be made available to appropriate personnel.

Disagree ←→ Agree
1 2 3 4 5

CHECK ONE BOX

This form is being completed by:

☐ Superintendent
☐ Principal, Asst. Principal, Adm. Ai
☐ Counselor
☐ Appraisal Person
☐ Teacher
☐ Special Ed. Administrator
☐ Other, specify ____________

APPENDIX XII

New Revised Manual

A MANUAL FOR
UNDERSTANDING THE SPECIAL EDUCATION
APPRAISAL PROCESS
(THE MODEL APPROACH)

INTRODUCTION

A student may not receive special education services unless the student is appraised and meets the eligibility criteria. The appraisal process is the heart of the special education delivery system and, as such, should be fully understood by everyone in education. This manual is designed to give an explanation to the procedures used in the appraisal process and the reasons why those procedures are followed.

The contents of this manual reflect the model appraisal system not necessarily the way it is always applied.

PART I - WHY SO MANY RULES?

Why so many rules? This is a hard question for special educators to understand, because of the volumes of rules and regulations governing all aspects of education. There are probably more court rulings, laws, policies, administrative directives, rules, regulations, and edicts concerning the operation of the public schools than any other institution or aspect of life in the world today.

Here are comments which reflect these rules in action:

1. "You are not a junior, so you cannot enroll in this course."
2. "I am sorry he must be five on or before September 1 or he cannot enroll in kindergarten."
3. "If you played football last year you are ineligible for the varsity squad this year."
4. "How can we identify the extra milk students if free lunch tickets will be the same color, size, and shape of all other meal tickets?"
5. "Did you really think, Jane, that we would let you come to school dressed that way?"
6. "I'm sorry, Mrs. Jones, but your eighteen-year-old daughter says you can't see her records."
7. The Title I schools this year will be . . .
8. "Why do we have registers anyway?"
9. The next fire drill will be obstructed, that means . . .
10. "Yes, I agree with you." "The builder should have told you that the district line was two houses south of your new home."

The special educator has a hard time understanding how there can be any criticism of rules regarding special education when he is surrounded by rules governing everything in education from his minimum salary to his assigned parking space. Unfortunately, the answer to questions raised about special education rules are usually worse than no answer at all. Typically, the agency is quoted, the legislature is blamed, the central office is cited, or the past is relived.

The answer is really simple. Rules and regulations governing special education are designed to be in the best interest of students.

Many of the rules and regulations are designed to prevent special education enrollment of students who do not meet the standards. It is generally agreed that to label a student handicapped who is not is worse than to deny placement to a student whose condition is questionable.

Special education funds are provided to solve or at least temper the effects of physical, emotional, or mental conditions found in students. Resources in the form of staff, materials, and services are not to replace regular education or to solve all grouping problems. They are not provided to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio or to teach the slow learner.

Yes, the appraisal process does have regulations. These rules or regulations are actually less numerous and in most cases more necessary than many other requirements for other aspects of education. If it were your son or daughter, would the procedure be right?

PART II - WHAT IS THE APPRAISAL PROCESS?

To quote the Texas Education Agency (Bulletin 7-11, p. 13) "The appraisal process is an orderly and systematic continuum of services for pupils which provides for: referral, screening, data analysis and alternatives, comprehensive assessment, admission, review, and dismissal, dissemination, and evaluation."

Let's look at the various aspects of this process and see how it applies to a student being considered for special education services for the first time.

A. Referral - Seeing a Problem

It would be impractical, highly expensive, and possibly harmful to consider everyone for special education through some type of mass testing program. Most experts suggest that students should remain in regular education programs unless they need services. Even then the special education services should be at the lowest possible level (least restrictive).

A student has to be referred or called to the attention of the appraisal personnel of the district before anything happens. Since this first step is so important it should be clearly understood by all concerned.

Ideally, the referral will be by the classroom teacher. In the case of team teaching, secondary students, or other arrangements where the student has several teachers; the referral may come from any one of the teachers.

Referral authority is not limited to classroom teachers. The referral may be made by the parents. This is generally the case with pre-school students, students new to the area, or students with concerned parents (often overly concerned).

Referrals may be mady by the librarian, nurse, principal, professional member of the community, public or private agencies, or, indeed, anyone who has a legitimate interest in the student. This includes the student himself.

The referral from the teacher is always to the counselor. The rule of thumb should be always "refer if in doubt."

Some of the reasons for referral may be:

1. Withdrawn behavior
2. Immaturity, as compared to peers
3. Failure to achieve academically
4. Inattention
5. Impulsive, driven tendencies
6. Socially unacceptable behavior
7. Sudden changes in personality

This is by no means a complete list. Care should be taken not to refer students who:

1. Have been fully appraised recently for the same problem.
2. Are achieving in line with their apparent global ability; unless achievement is extremely low.
3. Are new and haven't adjusted to their new surroundings unless problem is severe.

A formal referral requires the completing of the referral form. This is necessary in order to:

1. Provide a written statement of the problem so that the many persons involved in the appraisal process will be aware of the difficulties or concerns raised by referring party.
2. Give the available information generally needed during the process such as birthday, previous testing, etc.
3. Make certain that the problem is clear enough to reduce to writing.
4. Give the counselor a written record of the case for review as the process proceeds.

The parents must be notified that the referral has been made. This provides the assurance that the parents have been placed on notice that a problem may exist. It reassures the parents of the concern of the school. This requirement also allows the parents an opportunity to take steps outside of the school setting in seeking answers if they feel the need. Again, if it were your son or daughter wouldn't you appreciate this information?

B. Screening - Is It Really A Problem?

The model system has a good counselor who, in conjunction with the teacher, recognizes the problem as either one for possible special education intervention or redirects the problem to other alternatives. The counselor is not expected to do all of the work, but serves as the catalyst to make certain that the student referred obtains all of the help that the system has to offer as appropriate.

The teacher, if he or she made the referral, has already contacted the parent. The counselor will make what should be the second contact. Perhaps the difficulties observed by the teacher can be explained or a solution can be found. For example, the problem stated could be inattention, frequent drowsiness, and often irritable behavior. The parents may indicate to the counselor that the child stays awake until the mother comes home from work at 11:00 p.m. or so. Often parents will discuss things with a skilled counselor that they are reluctant to share with a teacher.

It is considered essential that the counselor talk with the parents face-to-face. Even a home visit may be helpful if the situation appears to warrant it.

The background information form must be completed at this time. This form can give valuable insight into many problems. Clear indications of development problems such as some forms of retardation or inherited tendencies such as some types of learning disabilities can be identified as suspects for the source of the problem by reading a properly completed background form. Even physically related problems can be pinpointed by this form (such as minimum brain injury). The background information form is confidential and should be treated as such. The form may show, for example, that the child with shy withdrawn behavior not only has the one stepfather found listed on the school enrollment records but has had three or four stepfathers in the last several years.

This background information can be so important that it should never be treated casually. Do not send it home by the child or hand it to the mother during refreshment time at a P.T.A. meeting.

In order to be true to the promise of suggesting "the model" let's put all of these activities in sequence.

The parents were notified that a referral to the counselor was occurring. This notification automatically informs them that the screening process will take place. The counselor calls them in for a conference. At this conference the background information form is signed. Also the counselor should obtain the language statement and permission for individual testing if it is needed.

Next the vision and hearing channels should be checked. Here the nurse will check the vision to be certain that the student referred has no acuity problem. Please remember that a vision screening done by the nurse is only that - a screening test. If a student passes, it does not mean that he does not have a vision problem. It means only that he has acceptable distance vision and should be able to clearly see the chalkboard and other places in the room. Conversely, if a student fails the vision screening test, it doesn't mean that he needs glasses or that glasses will solve his problem. It only means that a complete examination by a vision specialist must be done before the process can proceed. Please note that the district will pay for this complete vision test if the family is unable to do so.

The same standards apply to the hearing screening as well. The district cannot pay for treatment to correct conditions found by a hearing specialist or a vision specialist, but generally ways can be found to finance such intervention if the family is unable to do so.

The insistence on a hearing and vision screening with follow-up, where indicated, is in the best interest of the student. Students who have had poor vision or poor hearing generally do not know that they have this problem. Often students can make remarkable progress, both academically and socially when such conditions are found and corrected.

Since each referral is different, each campus is different, and each student is different - no universal on-campus screening procedure is possible. In almost every case the student referred should be seen by the speech therapist if possible. Very often the problem can be related to oral or written language expression difficulties. It is possible that the intervention of a speech therapist can solve the problem raised by the teacher.

The special education personnel assigned to the campus may wish to administer some screening instruments such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, the Wide Range Achievement Test, the Spache Diagnostic Test or other such tests. These can be helpful in determining whether the student may be a special education candidate, may have more problems or different ones than the classroom teacher suspected, or may reveal nothing not already known. Unfortunately, with turnover in personnel and demands on time it is not always possible to obtain this on-campus service.

The counselor has the parent(s) sign forms giving permission for individual testing and providing the language statement before the screening committee meets for several reasons. If the language statement indicates that the home language is other than English, the bilingual program may be the best route to take in obtaining help for the student. Certainly, using a language other than English at home could have real impact on the student's behavior at school. This possibility will be thoroughly checked before the appraisal process is completed even if the parents fail to indicate that English is not their home language.

Whenever a parent agrees to individual testing, it usually means that they also feel the student has a problem. If they disagree with the referral, this gives them an opportunity to express themselves at this time. Failure of the parents to agree to testing, which may not occur anyway, usually means one of several things:

1. The information assembled to date needs to be carefully studied to make certain that a problem does exist.
2. That the school has not done a good job keeping the parents informed of their child's progress or problems.
3. That the case should be studied further to see if there are related problems not known to the school. For example, a mother having a divorce hearing pending may be unwilling to allow testing for fear the results could be used by her husband to reduce child support payments. Perhaps an older student several grades behind is receiving social security payments which would stop sooner if the student was placed in a special education program (cooperative work-study) where he could complete his high school diploma. The failure to sign may reflect a fear of what this testing may reveal about other members of the family; such as child abuse, incest, mental illness of a sibling, alcoholism, or other closet-type situations. Each incident of a refusal to agree to testing should be a clear indicator to the counselor to dig deeper. Each such refusal should be called to the attention of the principal.
4. Such refusal to sign may indicate unhappiness with the progress shown by a sibling already in a special education program. If this is suspected, the special education administrator should be notified so that extra efforts could be made to determine if such a problem does exist.
5. It may mean that the family is divided on what is best for the child. If the contacts have always been with the mother, maybe the father should be invited in for a conference.
6. It may mean only that the family is not convinced of the problem.

Regardless of the reason two things are certain. Educators must always remember that the parents have the final authority in all matters related to special education for their children. Also that the appraisal process cannot continue against the wishes of the parents.

Assuming the referral is still valid and the road blocks have been passed - the student's case is now ready for the screening committee. The screening committee plays a key role in determining the future of the student. As such, proper importance should be placed on the makeup of the committee and the decision it reaches.

Administration must be represented on the committee because of this element's ability to implement various recommendations. For example, the screening committee may suggest that a different teacher be assigned, etc. An administrator from the special education department can meet the requirement but should be depended upon only if the principal, assistant principal, or administrative aide cannot be present.

The teacher making the referral should certainly be present. If for no other purpose, an update of the situation is indicated. It is not necessary for all the teachers working with the student to be present at this screening committee meeting but they should have input either orally through someone else, in writing, send copies of the student's work, or be called for reaction to a specific point if indicated.

Naturally the biggest question of a technical nature is whether the student should be tested for special education consideration. An appraisal person must be present to be a part of this decision.

Thus, administration, instruction, and appraisal must all be present. Since the counselor plays such a key role certainly he or she will be present. In our model plan the counselor will schedule the meeting, make certain all data is present, and chair the meeting.

The options of the screening committee are many. These include, but are not limited to:

1. Decide to appraise to determine special education eligibility
2. Hold decision until additional data is collected (such as report of student's visit to a vision specialist)
3. Suggest an on-campus change effecting his regular education schedule (such as a different teacher - no P.E., etc.)
4. Assign to special education personnel for diagnostic services
5. Ask one of the staff persons to do follow-up (such as the nurse to check out free lunch, the counselor to contact the father, the principal to check into child abuse, or the coach to talk with boy about his odor)

Should parents be invited to the screening committee? As a general rule no, since it would tend to slow the process. This option should be left open for the parents to attend if their presence could be useful. This decision should be exclusively left up to the principal. The same answer is applicable for the ARD committee meeting.

The screening committee's decision sets the stage for the final aspect of the appraisal process for original entrance into special education - the Admission, Review, and Dismissal Committee.

C. Comprehensive Assessment - Is This A Student For Special Education?

The next step in this sequence is to obtain all the data possible on the student, analyze the data, and reach a conclusion. This conclusion must be one that can be reduced to writing so that anyone having a responsibility for the student can have this information for their consideration.

An important item of information to be obtained is the results of a complete medical evaluation. This should be obtained before individual assessment of an appraisal nature is attempted. Circumstances often prevent this until after individual testing is done. However, no student will be placed in special education without it. The medical examination purpose is twofold. To rule out medically related problems and to focus attention on medical problems for possible correction.

Financially, this is the parents' responsibility if at all possible. Where this is a problem, the district will assist.

In our attempt to give the ideal model for appraisal services, the doctor would be provided information on why the school was asking for the medical (to rule out physical problems), what the eligibility criteria is for special education placement, and any abnormal conditions the school has noted which should be investigated. As usual, a form is provided to inform the doctor and for him to use to send back to the school his findings.

Please note that the medical doctor is not being asked to determine the educational placement of a youngster. It is not the intent of this medical requirement to force the family doctor into approving or disapproving the actual decision of special education placement.

The individual testing part of the appraisal process is often surrounded by mystery. Appraisal people do things that "only they" can do, in a secluded place, and report results in a language only known to a few.

Actually it isn't that way at all. Appraisal personnel do have a job to do. They have the college training and the practical experience for the job. They know how to administer and determine the results on a broad range of commercially produced tests. Their training is similar to a pharmacist who knows what to mix to provide a workable medication.

Working in a quiet place out of the mainstream of the school is not for their convenience. Most appraisal personnel could administer individual instruments to an attentive subject in Yankee Stadium during opening day. The insistence on a quiet place is for the benefit of the student being tested.

Every campus should be prepared to provide the best testing facility available when one of the students from that school is being tested. If nothing else is available, the principal's office can be easily converted into a testing center for the time required.

The information obtained from the individual must be viewed in a proper context:

1. It is indicative of one test(s) given to one student during a part of one day in his life under conditions different, if not completely strange to the student.
2. All tests have norms standardized over various segments of the population but never with students exactly like the one being tested.
3. The test(s) given will be just part of the complete assessment.

The appraisal personnel have an obligation to obtain results that reflect the student's true level not to find him eligible or ineligible. They are professionals provided by state funds to perform an essential service. It is not their responsibility to tailor the testing to meet the wishes of the parents, students, or other educators. To do less than the best job they can possibly do in determining the true picture of a student is unethical and grounds for dismissal.

The actual battery of tests used will vary greatly with the situation, the student, and the examiner. The following are some of the issues which must be taken into account:

1. What is the age of the student?

   Some test instruments are not valid for very young or for older students.

2. What physical limitations does the student have?

   It might be cruel to ask a blind student to do certain performance tests.

3. What testing has already been done?

   If valid testing done elsewhere is on file, it might be necessary to only fill in the gaps or to do only a limited battery to meet a specific need expressed by the screening committee.

4. What does the referral and other information already collected imply?

   Usually, the type of testing needed is geared to the minimum needed to qualify a student and write an educational plan.

   This is both cost effective and best serves the student's needs. The examiner is the expert so he or she should decide on what test(s) to give.

5. Does the testing indicate any condition not already suspected?

   If so, the examiner may need to consult with other appraisal personnel, do additional follow-up testing, or refer on to a different type of appraisal specialist.

6. Is the student able to present a valid picture in the testing situation?

   Accuracy is far more important than speed. Some students do not relate well to strangers. This may require several meetings to establish rapport before formal assessment can commence. The attention span may prove to be so short that the testing schedule will have to be so short that the testing schedule will have to be divided into several sessions. Even the physical health or the emotional condition of a student may dictate a different approach. On occasion testing must be scheduled off the campus at a central location or in the student's home to obtain valid results.

Basically, the appraisal person is looking for the answer to two questions: Does the physical, emotional, or mental status of the student require the intervention of a rather expensive service like special education? Does the student's profile lend itself to recommendation and if so what should those recommendations be? Regardless of the results of the appraisal, there should be concrete recommendations made by the appraisal person on every student he sees.

If the student does not meet the eligibility for special education services, the appraisal person must so state. If the student does meet the eligibility, it does not mean an automatic placement. The input of all educators knowledgeable of the student is needed before a decision of placement can be made. Special education is not designed for slow learners, underachievers, behavioral problems or students just troublesome to the classroom teacher.

In every case, an appraisal report will be provided to the home campus of the student. This will be a written report. Nearly all reports have five basic sections:

1. The Heading - Here the student is identified by name, age, date of birth, name of school, grade placement, and sex. Also included is the date of the testing, the name of the examiner and the person who made the referral.

2. A Statement of The Problem - This may look very familiar to the referring teacher. Unless it has been changed by the screening committee, the problem raised is the one to be resolved. Hopefully, the statement will be expressed in a way to invite a solution.

3. The Information Gathered - This section will generally have several subheadings. However, the information found here will include the background information and other sociological variables (if appropriate), the test administered by name, the test results by global statements (such as verbal, performance, and full scale scores or achievement scores expressed in years and months, etc.), the impression of the examiner, and other data which might prove valuable.

4. Conclusion or Summary - This section is generally short. It puts all of the pieces available to the examiner into one or two observations. It gives the impressions and facts that the examiner sees as the true picture of the student. Included will be the statement of the student's status for eligibility for special education.

5. Recommendations - This is the most important aspect of the report. The examiner is professionally bound to make recommendations regarding the student as a result of the information gathered. These recommendations are nearly always things to be carried out by others. In addition, the final recommendations are the province of the ARD committee. These recommendations of the appraisal person should never be ignored. They generally reflect the most carefully thought out remarks concerning individual students that are ever put in writing during a student's total time in the education system.

Appraisal reports are easier to read and understand than group test scores recorded in cumulative records. They are certainly far easier to read than most educational articles found in educational journals. Familiarity is the key to understanding appraisal reports. Another good technique to developing a true understanding is to ask for clarification on any item. There are no dumb questions. The best friend a student has is one who can intelligently discuss the findings of the appraisal.

5. Admissions, Review, and Dismissal - The Final Authority

The two strongest concepts in education today are individualization and the team approach. Individualization guarantees that students will have their needs addressed on a personal basis. This is the philosophy behind grouping for instruction, providing electives, or even "try outs" for the band. The team approach guarantees that more than one opinion will be heard, that different frameworks will be represented, and that no one person will have the total responsibility.

The admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) aspect of the appraisal process combines these two concepts. It is in effect a team representing different disciplines making a decision or several decisions about an individual student.

In order for this team concept to function, there must be a gathering of the persons making this team. This is called the ARD committee. Just as on the screening committee; administration, instruction, and appraisal must be represented. Each component of the educational staff makeup must be represented to make this a true team approach.

The appraisal person should be in attendance to defend the conclusion and recommendation sections of the appraisal report. Also they are expected to provide the committee with personal observations and insight to assist the other committee members in their deliberations.

Certainly instructional personnel will be in attendance. This should include the referring teacher and at least one special education teacher. Anyone who has information pertinent to the case or anyone who might reasonably be expected to assist with the student as a result of the committee's deliberations should be present. Certainly a limit has to be placed. Flexibility and timing are keys in making certain that the right personnel are present.

The administrative component should be present and should chair the meeting. The administration will shoulder the burden of implementation of the recommendations regardless whether they involve changes in regular education programming, special education placement, or something outside of the school structure.

The importance of the counselor should not be overlooked at the ARD committee. The best information about family can come from this source. The counselor will be expected to interpret the test results and to obtain final parental approval.

The name for this committee is very interesting and often forgotten by the committee members themselves when a difficult case arises. The admission nomenclature is simple. The committee can decide to place or refuse to place a student into special education. The review aspect and the dismissal authority is something else again.

To review means the ability for once again looking at all the data to reach a decision. Thus, an ARD committee should always be mindful of the possibility of reviewing a student's placement even before the original decision is made. Often a student may be eligible for special education but there is a real question as to whether he or she needs it or would profit from it. The ability to restudy the question at a later date can play an important part in making the original determination.

The dismissal aspect of the committee has little to do with the model for original placement. It is sufficient to say that a placement in special education is not a life sentence nor does meeting the eligibility criteria guarantee the permanent solution of the problem.

Several questions common to any ARD committee are:

1. What is our primary purpose?

   The primary purpose of the ARD committee when meeting on an original referral is to decide on the best educational placement for that student.

2. What are our options?

The options available to an ARD committee are limited only by creativity limitations. The official one is to accept or deny placement in special education. The committee can request additional testing, recommend programmatic changes, ask for therapy for the student, or recommend a change of teacher or school assignment.

3. What if some members do not agree with the majority on the committee?

The ARD committee form allows a place for a "disagree" position to be stated. The student's needs are best served when there is enough thought to indicate several sources of assistance.

4. Does the principal have the final vote?

No, the team concept doesn't give the principal's vote any more weight than any other member. A principal who ignores the advice of his or her staff and who makes a decision on the personal bias or political expertize is on very thin ice.

5. What about the child who doesn't qualify but who still needs help?

Special education is not designed to solve all the problems of education. All cases have solutions - finding them can be difficult. If a slow learner is failing, then maybe the curriculum should be revised in the student's classroom. If student behavior problems are a real concern of the school, perhaps inservice should be given to the entire staff.

Repeated referrals from a teacher or students having difficulties but who do not qualify may indicate that the teacher needs supervision assistance. It may even indicate that that classroom needs a new teacher.

6. What happens if we approve the student for special education placement but the parents refuse?

Parents, in our model system, have the final authority to accept or reject special education placement. A good counselor and a strong principal can obtain the necessary approval from even the most reluctant parents if the decision is correct for the student.

7. Aside from recommendations and decisions, do we have any additional responsibilities?

> Yes, the ARD committee should write the educational plan. Generally this means define the major areas to be addressed and the materials or methods to be used. The step-by-step teaching strategies would be too time consuming for such a team to accomplish.

FOLLOW UP - PUTTING THE PLAN INTO ACTION

This section is provided only for reader clarification. All details on follow-up have been previously discussed in preceding sections. These additional comments are provided as they relate to a student who has been recommended for special education services.

The counselor will meet with the parents to interpret the test results, the decision of the ARD committee, and obtain the final agreement of the parents. The counselor will utilize the principal, the appraisal person, the special education teacher(s), or the regular teacher to assist in this if needed.

The educational plan will be finalized by the special education staff with the assistance of the appropriate appraisal person. This plan will include the amount of time necessary for special education instruction.

Mechanical details will be solved as the situation demands. Special education transportation will be arranged if indicated. The cumulative records plus the special education records will be sent to the receiving school if the student is being transferred to another campus.

The educational plan will be formally reviewed every three months or sooner if indicated. The ARD committee will automatically review the placement near the end of the school year.

SUMMARY

Yes, the appraisal process is structured and involved. All forms are essential in most cases and all steps necessary in this procedure. What could be changed to speed up the activities without losing sight of the best interest of the student? The informal lines of communication are always open. Any special education teacher or appraisal person should be expected to provide suggestions, recommend material, or to discuss any student with other educators when called upon to do so.

For your convenience a flowchart is included. Please do not hesitate to raise questions regarding the appraisal process if any arise.

MODEL APPRAISAL PROCESS

FLOWCHART

1. Problem noted - Parent contact made by teacher
2. Referral to Counselor - Referral Form completed; Decision made to continue referral process
3. Counselor Contacts Parent
4. Forms Completed
    a. Background Information Form
    b. Individual Testing and Language Statement Form
5. Screening
    a. Nurse checks vision and hearing
    b. Special education personnel administers screening tests (if appropriate)
6. Screening Committee Meets
    a. Administration, teaching, and appraisal represented
    b. Decision made as to steps to be taken
7. Individual Assessment Made
    a. Appraisal Testing
    b. Medical Examination
8. ARD Committee Meets
    a. Administration, teaching, and appraisal represented
    b. Decision made
9. Counselor gives test interpretation to parents and obtain placement signature

APPENDIX XIII

State Board Policy

NEW POLICY
1107

1107 Non-biased Pupil Appraisal Procedures

The State Board of Education commits itself to the belief that schools are responsible for ensuring that students of a particular race, sex, national origin, or primary home language are not denied the opportunity to obtain the education generally obtained by other students in the system.

It affirms that school districts should exercise particular care in the referral, assignment, or placement of students to any of a variety of special programs--including special education, migrant, bilingual, gifted and talented, and vocational programs--so that such procedures do not discriminate against students on the basis of race, sex, national origin, or primary home language.

In order to be non-discriminatory in the aforementioned areas, any selection procedure must be formulated and administered solely on criteria appropriate to meeting the special educational needs of the student for whom the program is designed and, further, must provide for timely reassessment and opportunity for reassignment. Procedures and tests must be used which give adequate consideration to such factors, related to the assessment of learning, as socio-cultural and adaptive behaviors of students being tested, and linguistic and cultural competencies of test examiners. Similarly, adequate consideration to these factors should be included in the training of teachers, aides, and other instructional personnel.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

CHAPTER 3. PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

SERIES 3500 ADAPTATIONS FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

SUB-SERIES 3570 HANDICAPPED

3572 Special Education Program Elements in General

3572.4 Determination of Pupil Eligibility (continued)

(b) Mentally Retarded

(b-a) Educable Mentally Retarded

(1) Written comprehensive intellectual assessment revealing deficits ~~in all essential learning processes~~ between two and three standard deviation units below the mean ~~of the general population on~~ as tested by verbal scales, performance scales, and adaptive behavior scales

(2) Written report of educational appraisal ~~which will include~~ including the assessment of abilities and disabilities and instructional and behavioral recommendations for teaching which describe the educational environment and specific methods and strategies ~~which will~~ to maximize learning

(3) Physician's written report of general medical evaluation

(b-b) Trainable Mentally Retarded

(1) Written comprehensive intellectual assessment revealing deficits ~~in all essential learning processes~~ three or more standard deviation units ~~or more~~ below the mean ~~of the general population~~ as tested by verbal scales, performance scales, and adaptive behavior scales.

(2) Written report of educational appraisal ~~which will include~~ including the assessment of abilities and disabilities and instructional and behavioral recommendations for teaching which describe the educational environment and specific methods and strategies ~~which will~~ to maximize learning

(3) Physician's written report of general medical evaluation

CHAPTER 3. PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

SERIES 3500 ADAPTATIONS FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

SUB-SERIES 3570 HANDICAPPED

3572 Special Education Program Elements in General

3572.5 Pupil Placement in Special Education Services (continued)

(b-d) Comprehensive Individual Assessment

Comprehensive individual assessment is the observation, diagnosing, and identification of individual pupil achievement and/or adjustment characteristics. It provides all necessary information for developing ~~the~~ an appropriate educational plan, determining eligibility for special education services, and ~~information for~~ planning appropriate instructional arrangements.

Comprehensive individual assessment includes the following ~~appropriate~~ factors when appropriate:

(1) language factors

Comprehensive appraisal of language consists of individual assessment of language dominance and proficiency--both expressive and receptive.

(2) ~~intelligence factor~~ intellectual functioning

Comprehensive appraisal of intelligence consists of individually administered test(s) of mental ability designed to assess a wide range of intelligence factors from verbal scales, performance scales, and adaptive behavior scales. Adaptive behavior is the effectiveness or degree with which the individual meets the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of the age and cultural group.

Verbal scales shall be administered in the pupil's demonstrated dominant language.

Data to determine intellectual functioning are not gathered from single-area reference test(s) such as vocabulary, strictly verbal tests, or strictly perceptual-motor tests. Such instruments may be used as a part of or in addition to a comprehensive battery to assess a wide range of intelligence factors, but they may not be used to determine total intellectual functioning.

Assessment instruments used to assess verbal, performance, and adaptive behaviors related to the measurement of intellectual functioning must be selected from a list provided by the Commissioner of Education as approved by the State Board of Education.

It has been the operating guidelines of the Texas Education Agency to require only group intelligence tests to establish normal intelligence, as required for eligibility for five of the six handicapping conditions. The sixth handicapping condition, mental retardation, specifically requires individual assessments of intellectual functionings. Assessment instruments selected from the following list must be used whenever an individual assessment of intellectual functioning is needed to meet eligibility criteria for specific handicapping conditions.

Verbal Scales

	Age Range	Standard Deviation
Slosson Intelligence Test	0+	17-31 (depending on age)
Stanford-Binet	2+	16
WAIS (Verbal)	16+	15
WISC (Verbal)	5-15	15
WISC-R (Verbal)	6-16	15
WPPSI (Verbal)	4-6	15

Performance Scales (includes non-verbal scales)

	Age Range	Standard Deviation
Arthur Point Scale	5-15	
Columbia Mental Maturity Scale	3½-9	16
Hiskey-Nebraska	3-16	
Leiter International Performance Scale	2-18	
Ravens Progressive Matrices	6-65	
Stanford-Binet	2+	16
WAIS (Performance)	16+	15
WISC (Performance)	5-15	15
WISC-R (Performance)	6-16	15
WPPSI (Performance)	4-6	15

Adaptive Behavior Scales

AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale (Public School Version)
Mercer's Adaptive Behavior Scale

Permission for the use of other tests on a pilot or experimental basis may be obtained through the Commissioner of Education. Suggestions for additions to this list may be submitted to the Commissioner of Education for consideration and presentation to the State Board of Education for approval.

When it has been determined through comprehensive appraisal of language dominance that a student's dominant language is other than English, appraisal instruments should be administered in the other language. Where no clear language dominance is demonstrated, appraisal instruments should be administered in both English and the child's other language. When translating an instrument from English to another language, every effort must be made to maintain the original intent and purpose of each item. Interpretation of scores derived from translated instruments must take into consideration possible errors or inconsistencies in literal or conceptual translation. Ideally, the examiner for such appraisal shall be fluent in both English and the langugae of the student, and sensitive to the differences in culture of the student which may affect the appraisal. Where no bilingual examiner is available, an interpreter may be used, recognizing the additional problems inherent in interpreting data gathered in that manner.

Professional judgment must be exercised in selecting assessment techniques which are most appropriate for the individual child being assessed.

(3) educational functioning

Comprehensive appraisal of educational functioning consists of securing data from formal and/or informal tests in the appropriate skill areas related to developmental, pre-academic, academic, pre-vocational, or vocational levels of performance. Consideration shall be given to the language of instruction and to the pupil's demonstrated dominant language when selecting measures of educational functioning.

(4) sociological variables

Comprehensive appraisal of sociological variables consists of identifying the family and home environmental situation influencing the student's learning and/or behavioral patterns. Sociological data are obtained through voluntary communication and cooperation with the family.

(5) medical and health factors

Comprehensive appraisal of health factors consists of a medical assessment and diagnosis of the student's physical condition, intended to reveal factors which have influence on student achievement and/or adjustment. When a health problem is perceived or suspected by either the referring party, screening committee, appraisal personnel, or as required to meet eligibility criteria, an appropriate medical opinion will be obtained.

(6) emotional and/or behavioral factors

Comprehensive appraisal of emotional and/or behavioral factors consists of data gathered from psychological and/or medical sources, teacher observation, and/or family information. This information is obtained when a behavioral and/or emotional problem is perceived or suspected by either the referring party, screening committee, appraisal personnel, or as required to meet eligibility criteria.

Each school is responsible for establishing a procedure for collecting the comprehensive individual appraisal data in a systematic manner to be submitted to the Admission, Review, and Dismissal Committee.

APPENDIX XIV

Examples of Individually Administered Tests of Intelligence

EXAMPLES OF INDIVIDUALLY ADMINISTERED TESTS OF INTELLIGENCE

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, Form L-M (ages 2 and over), Houghton Mifflin.

Wechsler Preschool & Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI) (ages 4 - 6. Includes verbal scales and performance scales.), Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) (ages 5-15. Includes verbal scales and performance scales.), Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (WISC-R) (ages 6-16. Includes verbal scales and performance scales.), Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) (ages 16 - adult. Includes verbal scales and performance scales.), Psychological Corporation.

Leiter International Performance Scale (ages 2 - 18. Requires no verbalization from the examiner or student.), Western Psychological Services.

Hiskey-Nebraska Test of Learning Aptitude (ages 3 - 17. Requires no verbalization from examiner or student. Standardized on both deaf and hearing children.), Union College Press.

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) (ages 2½ - adult. Gives an estimate of verbal intelligence.), American Guidance Service, Inc.

Columbia Mental Maturity Scale (ages 3 - 9. Requires no verbal response from student.), Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Arthur Point Scale of Performance Tests, Revised Form 11 (ages 5 - 15. Nonverbal, performance test), Psychological Corporation.

Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude (ages 3 - adult), Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.

McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities (ages 2½ - 8½. Assesses intellectual and motor development.), Psychological Corporation.

Slosson Intelligence Test (ages 4 - adult. A highly verbal test often used in screening.), Slosson Educational Publications.

EXAMPLES OF INDIVIDUALLY ADMINISTERED TESTS OF ACHIEVEMENT

Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) (ages 5 - adult. Subtests cover reading word recognition, spelling and arithmetic.), Guidance Associates.

Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT) (age 5 - adult. Subtests cover mathematics, reading recognition, reading comprehension, spelling and general information.), American Guidance Service, Inc.

EXAMPLES OF INDIVIDUALLY ADMINISTERED DIAGNOSTIC READING TESTS

Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (grades 1 - 6), Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales (grades 1 - 8), CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Gates-McKillop Reading Diagnostic Tests (grades 1 - 7), Teachers College Press.

Gray Oral Reading Test (grades 1 - adult), Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.

Gilmore Oral Reading Test (grades 1 - 8), Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Roswell-Chall Diagnostic Reading Test of Word Analysis Skills (grades 1 - 4), Essay Press.

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests (grades kindergarten - 12), American Guidance Service, Inc.

EXAMPLES OF INDIVIDUALLY ADMINISTERED DIAGNOSTIC ARITHMETIC TESTS

Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Tests (preschool - grade 8), American Guidance Service, Inc.

Diagnostic Tests and Self-Helps in Arithmetic (grades 3 - 7, may be group administered), CTB/McGraw-Hill.

EXAMPLES OF DIAGNOSTIC TESTS OF SPELLING AND/OR WRITTEN EXPRESSION

Kottmeyer Diagnostic Spelling Test (grades 1 - 6), Teacher's Guide for Remedial Reading by William Kottmeyer, Webster Publishing Co.

Gates-Russell Diagnostic Spelling Test (grades 2 - 6), Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, N.Y.

Myklebust Picture Story Language Test (ages 7 - 17. A developmental scale for written language.), Grune & Stratton, Inc.

EXAMPLES OF INDIVIDUALLY ADMINISTERED SPECIAL PURPOSE TESTS

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Ages 2 - 10. A diagnostic test used to evaluate language and cognitive functioning. A Stanford Binet IQ equivalent can be derived.) University of Illinois Press.

Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test (Ages 5 - 11. A visual-motor test.), Grune & Stratton, Inc.

Beery Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration (Ages 2 - 15. A structured, visual-motor test.), Follett Publishing Company.

Wepman Spatial Orientation Memory Test (Ages 5 - 9. Tests ability to retain and recall the orientation of visually presented forms.), Language Research Associates.

Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language (Ages 3 - 6. Measures understanding of English or Spanish language structure.), Learning Concepts, Inc.

Goldman-Fristoe Woodcock Auditory Skills Test Battery (Ages 3 - adult. A comprehensive battery for assessment of auditory skills.), American Guidance Service, Inc.

Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test (Ages 5 - 8. A series of 40 word pairs to test auditory discrimination.), Language Research Associates.